

# THE CLERGY REVIEW

## CONTEMPLATION IN SAINT THOMAS AQUINAS

BY THE REV. DOM DAVID KNOWLES, O.S.B., M.A.

### *Second Article.*

**W**E must now endeavour to look more closely at contemplation itself. What is, for St. Thomas, *contemplatio Dei, divinorum, divinae veritatis*? What faculties, habits, virtues does it employ, and how do they proceed to work?

St. Thomas is explicit and consistent. There are in the natural order three, and only three, intellectual virtues which aid man to arrive at and consider truth—wisdom, which considers the ultimate, unifying cause; knowledge, which is reached by the reason's work upon this subject or that; and understanding, which is a simple, absolutely certain grasp of first principles.<sup>68</sup> With these three virtues natural man arrives at and "contemplates" truth.

The Christian who has been re-born in grace, who has begun the new, eternal existence which is the knowledge of God and a sharing of His nature and life, has powers far superior to these. At the beginning of this essay we quoted some words in which a distinguished scholar deprecated any reference to the theology of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost in connection with contemplation, but if we are to comprehend the thought of St. Thomas such an elimination would seem impossible. We might, if we so wished, construct a theological system in which the Gifts were saluted reverently from afar and then passed by; we may, if we desire, follow the opinions, admittedly different in some respects from St. Thomas,

<sup>68</sup> I-II, lvii, 2. *Utrum sit tantum tres habitus intellectuales speculativi.*

of Scotist theologians or of some of the theologians of the Counter-Reformation; but if we are endeavouring to elucidate the thought of St. Thomas we cannot leave out of the reckoning some of its essential elements, and to describe contemplation in isolation from the Gifts would be as impossible as to describe the working of the telephone with no reference to electricity.

Here again much misapprehension arises from concentration on a few Questions of the *Summa* in isolation from all others. Probably many who are interested in the problems of the spiritual life read with some care the great Questions on the contemplative life, but are scarcely aware of the number of Questions devoted to the Gifts in the *Prima Secundae* and the *Secunda Secundae*.<sup>69</sup> Still less are they aware of the intimate connection these latter Questions have with the Questions on contemplation. If, however, we glance at the Commentary on the Sentences, the matter appears in a very different light. There, after the Gifts in general have been discussed and explained, and some of them treated in detail, St. Thomas discusses and compares the two lives, active and contemplative, in which they operate, and after an exposition of the contemplative life and its dignity, which is substantially the same as that in the *Summa*, he returns to discuss the two contemplative Gifts *par excellence*, Wisdom and Understanding.<sup>70</sup>

In the *Summa*, a more elaborate and methodical work, the elements which are thus grouped in the Commentary are picked out and reset in closer logical connection with other elements of doctrine. As the *Pars Secunda* deals with man, his end and endowments, the Gifts and Beatitudes in general are treated after the general discussion of the virtues moral, intellectual and theological; the individual Gifts are discussed in connection with the virtues with which they are connected, as Faith is with Understanding and Knowledge, Hope with Fear, and Wisdom with Charity. But the intimate connection

<sup>69</sup> The following is a brief list: I-II, lxviii-lxx (16 articles), the Gifts in general; II-II, viii, ix, Understanding, Knowledge; xix, Fear; xlv, Wisdom; lii, Counsel; cxxi, Piety; cxxxix, Fortitude.

<sup>70</sup> Commentary, D. 35, q. 2, art. 1. *Deinde quaeritur de donis perficientibus in utraque vita.*

of thought remains. The different Gifts are still assumed as perfecting Man's soul in the active and contemplative lives,<sup>71</sup> and foremost among them are the Gifts of Understanding and Knowledge perfecting Faith, and Wisdom which is closely connected with charity. It is an axiom throughout that sanctifying grace is the grace of the virtues and the Gifts,<sup>72</sup> and that the Gifts are superior to all the virtues save the three theological.<sup>73</sup>

Let us consider the doctrine of the two great Gifts of Wisdom and Understanding, as given first in the Commentary and then in the *Summa*. The articles in the Commentary are of very great depth and beauty, and deserve to be more familiar than they are to all interested in mystical theology. St. Thomas speaks of Understanding as follows:

Understanding, as its name suggests [*intellectus*, which St. Thomas took to be derived from *intus-legere*], implies an intimate knowledge of something. The senses and imagination touch the accidents, the understanding reaches to the essence. So faith, which causes us to hold spiritual truths as it were hidden in a glass and in a riddle, perfects our mind in a human manner. But if our mind is so elevated by spiritual light as to be led to see spiritual things in themselves, this surpasses the human manner of acting. This is what the Gift of Understanding does, which enlightens the mind concerning truths proposed to it so that like the first principles they are accepted as credible as soon as heard.<sup>74</sup>

How like to this is the doctrine of the *Summa*:

The term Understanding implies an intimate know-

<sup>71</sup> I-II, lxviii, 6, 3. Donorum quaedam perficiunt hominem in vita contemplativa, ut sapientia et intellectus. St. Thomas' reply to the objection formulated by the argument in which these words occur shows that he accepted the major premiss just quoted.

<sup>72</sup> The phrase *virtutes et dona* as summing up the whole Christian endowment occurs frequently, e.g., I-II, lxiix passim; III, lxii, 2. Utrum gratia sacramentalis aliquid addat super gratiam virtutum et donorum.

<sup>73</sup> I-II, lxviii, 8. Virtutes theologicae praeferuntur donis . . . sed . . . dona praeferuntur virtutibus (sc. intellectualibus et moralibus). Ibid., lxiix, 1. Dona sunt eminentiora virtutibus cardinalibus.

<sup>74</sup> D. 35, q. 2, art. 2. The last words are: ut ad modum primorum principiorum statim audita *probentur*.

ledge . . . sense knowledge touches the external, sensible qualities, intellectual knowledge reaches the essence . . . it is clear that the stronger the light of the understanding is, the more it can reach the heart of a thing. The natural light of our understanding is finite in power, and so can reach but a limited way; therefore man needs a *supernatural light* in order to penetrate to a knowledge of things which he cannot know by the natural light. This *supernatural light* which is given him is called the *Gift of Understanding*.<sup>75</sup>

This supernatural light (he goes on to say) which enlightens our higher reason, stands to revealed truth as the natural light of understanding does to the first principles. Its object is divine truth, both in itself and in connection with creatures.

If we now recapitulate St. Thomas' teaching on faith perfected by understanding, we must say that the object of faith is God apprehended in a manner beyond the grasp of our reason.<sup>76</sup> The supernatural principles of faith are grasped by a divine light,<sup>77</sup> and thus the mind of man is joined to God and to the Holy Spirit moving it.<sup>78</sup> Thus our supernatural knowledge of the things of God is founded in faith and perfected by the intellectual Gifts. Faith, as such, causes us to adhere to God, the first truth; to see that the truths are to be believed and to be ready to assent to them.<sup>79</sup> Charity, which gives us a right estimate of God as our last end, makes us capable of being enlightened further by the Gifts,<sup>80</sup> and of these Understanding enables us to penetrate and grasp

<sup>75</sup> II-II, viii, 1 corp. art. *Lumen autem naturale nostri intellectus est finitae virtutis . . . indiget ergo homo supernaturali lumine, ut ulterius penetret ad cognoscendum quaedam quae per lumen naturale cognoscere non valet.* This knowledge, of course, is essentially supernatural and "mystical."

<sup>76</sup> I-II, lxii, 2 corp. art. *Objectum theologiarum virtutum est ipse Deus . . . prout nostrae rationis cognitionem excedit.*

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., 3 corp. art. *Principia supernaturalia, quae divino lumine capiuntur.*

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., lxxviii, 8 corp. art. *Virtutes theologicae sunt quibus mens humana Deo conjungitur.*

<sup>79</sup> II-II, i, 4 ad 3.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., viii, 5. *Nisi usque ad hoc moveatur a Spiritu sancto intellectus humanus, ut rectam aestimationem de fine habeat, nondum consecutus est donum intellectus.*



that to which faith merely assents.<sup>81</sup> This it does by purifying the mind of all false and corporeal conceptions of divine things, that it may see God. This vision of God is twofold: either perfect, by which God's essence is seen; or imperfect, by which we see, not what God is, but what He is not, and that He exceeds all that we can understand.<sup>82</sup> And this latter vision is given here below by the Gift of Understanding, which thus gives a kind of added certainty to the virtue of faith.<sup>83</sup>

The manner in which this is given is developed as follows in the Commentary:

The Gift of Understanding approaches spiritual things in a twofold way. The one is by way of negation, which abstracts from spiritual things all that is found in things material. The other is that in which the gaze of the mind passes beyond this into spiritual things themselves. In this life Understanding approaches spiritual things, and especially God, in the first way . . . for so long as a man lives in this mortal body he cannot so advance *in divine contemplation* as to fix his mind's eye upon the boundless ray of divine light itself, but whatever is seen of God is not Himself, but beneath Him. But this gives satisfaction enough to our weak minds, for as the philosopher says, the lover is more delighted by a superficial apprehension of the beloved than by a full apprehension of all else.<sup>84</sup>

The Gift of Understanding, therefore, is an advance upon faith:

The natural way of human nature to perceive divine things is only in the mirror of creatures and the baffling shapes of distant resemblances, and for this perception faith the virtue [sc. faith exercised *as a virtue, humano modo*] perfects the soul. But the Gift of Understanding, as St. Gregory says, enlightens the mind concerning truths heard, so that

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., 6 ad 2. *Ad fidem pertinet assentire, ad donum vero intellectus pertinet mente penetrare ea quae dicuntur.*

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., 7 corp art. A most illuminating article; the similarity between the doctrine of St. Thomas and the great mystics will be apparent to all.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 8 ad 2. *Perfectio intellectus [i.e., the Gift] consequitur fidem, quae est virtus; ad quam quidem intellectus perfectionem sequitur quaedam fidei certitudo.*

<sup>84</sup> D. 35, q. 2, art. 2.

man even in this life receives a foretaste of the manifestation which is to come.<sup>85</sup>

And what of Wisdom? St. Thomas answers in a passage of lofty eloquence which seems to anticipate in every line the thought and fervour of his great disciple, the doctor of the Gifts, John of St. Thomas :

Wisdom by its very name, as commonly employed, seems to imply an eminent abundance of knowledge which gives self-evident certainty of things great and marvellous, unknown to others, and which can judge of all things, for everyone can judge well what he fully knows; and he can direct others by reason of that eminence of knowledge. Some have this abundance of knowledge as the result of learning and study added to a native quickness of intelligence; and this is the wisdom which Aristotle ranks among the intellectual virtues. But others have this supreme competence as the result of a kinship which they have to the things of God, as Denis says of Hierotheus that he learnt the things of God by their action upon him. And it is of such that the Apostle says : the spiritual man judges all things; and St. John : his unction teaches you of all things. . . . The Gift of Wisdom has this eminent knowledge as the result of a union with the things of God, and this union can only be by love, for : he who adheres to God is one spirit with him. Whence the Lord says that he has revealed the secrets of his Father to his disciples in so far as they are his friends. And therefore the Gift of Wisdom presupposes love as is principle, and so far is in the will; but essentially it consists in knowledge and so its act both here and hereafter is seen to be *the contemplation of the things of God which are loved*, and through them it judges of other things not only speculative, but practical.<sup>86</sup>

And thus " the Gift of Wisdom leads to a *Godlike and as it were explicit contemplation* of revealed truth which faith [i.e., the virtue as such] holds in a human manner

<sup>85</sup> D. 34, q. 1, art. 1. *Intellectus donum . . . mentem illustrat, ut homo etiam in hac vita praelibationem futuræ manifestationis accipiat.* The manner in which this vivid, but elusive phrase is changed in the *Summa* into something clearer, if at first sight less ardent, is a good example of the development of St. Thomas' powers. But we are not to suppose his conception of the sublimity of the Gift weakened.

<sup>86</sup> D. 35, q. 2, art. 1. The Latin of the words in italics runs : *unde ipsius actus videtur esse et hic et in futuro divina amata contemplari.*

as it were disguised."<sup>87</sup>

These pages are perhaps the noblest description in the whole of St. Thomas' works of that contemplation which he so frequently names. We feel as we read them that he is speaking of what he knows. In the *Summa*—a manual for learners—his language is at once less rich and more closely-knit, but the doctrine and the essential texts of Scripture are the same. Thus he distinguishes again and again between human, acquired wisdom—whether philosophical or theological—and the infused wisdom of a soul that loves. The distinction is made at the very beginning of the *Summa*, in an article too often neglected. St. Thomas is asking whether theology is wisdom, and puts the objection that whereas theology can be learnt, wisdom is infused; and hence is counted as one of the Gifts. He answers:

The function of wisdom is to judge; this can be done in two ways, either by way of tendency or sympathy, or by that of distinct knowledge. One who has the habit of a virtue judges the object and acts of it by his tendency or sympathy towards them, another, who has no habit of virtue, can judge of them by his knowledge of moral science. In the things of God the first way of judging belongs to wisdom, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, as it is written: the spiritual man judges all things; and Denis says: Hierotheus has been taught, not only by learning, but also by experiencing the things of God. The second way belongs to theology, as it is acquired by study.<sup>88</sup>

Let us not suppose that this wisdom is for St. Thomas a mere *façon de parler*, or an abstract possibility, which one labels and then passes by, as one might some rare technical term. Rather let us hear him speaking of the Mission of the Divine Persons to the soul:

The soul by grace is made like to God, and so if a divine person is sent to anyone by grace, the one who receives must be made like the divine person who is sent . . . and since the Holy Spirit is love, the soul is made like the Holy Spirit by the gift of charity. . . . The Son is the Word,

<sup>87</sup> Ibid. Proccedit enim sapientiae donum ad quandam deiformem contemplationem, et quodammodo explicitam articulorum [sc. contemplationem], quae fides sub quodam modo involuto tenet secundum humanum modum.

<sup>88</sup> I, i, 6 ad 3. "Hierotheus doctus est non solum discens, sed et patiens divina."

not any kind of word, but a Word breathing forth love. And so Augustine says: "that Word which we are endeavouring to describe is *knowledge with love*."<sup>80</sup> The Son therefore is not sent at every perfection of the intellect, but at that enlightenment of the intellect which breaks out into love, as it is written: Everyone who heareth from the Father and learneth, cometh to me. And: in my meditation a fire shall break forth. And so Augustine says significantly: the Son is sent, when he is known and perceived by anyone. Now perception denotes an *experimental knowledge*, and this is *Wisdom*, properly speaking.<sup>80</sup>

And when does such a mission take place? Not only at the moment of justification, but also:

at an advance in virtue and an increase of grace . . . when anyone advances to the grace of miracles or prophecy, or with burning love exposes himself to martyrdom, or *renounces all that he possesses, or initiates any difficult enterprise*.<sup>81</sup>

Now let us turn to the Question in the *Summa* which deals with Wisdom the Gift. The teaching is the same:

Wisdom, the Gift of the Holy Spirit, differs from the acquired intellectual virtue, for this last is acquired by human study, but the former comes down from above, as the Scripture says.<sup>82</sup> It differs also from faith, for faith assents, but Wisdom the Gift judges, and therefore presupposes faith, for a man judges well what he knows.<sup>83</sup>

And:

He who knows the highest cause of all, God, is called wise *sans phrase*, because he can judge all things in a divine

<sup>80</sup> The quotation is from *De Trinitate*, ix, 10. Cf. the words used constantly by St. John of the Cross to describe contemplation (e.g., *Living Flame*, III, 3 §5): "contemplation, which is a combination of divine knowledge and love—that is, loving knowledge."

<sup>81</sup> I, xliii, 5 ad 2. The last words in the Latin are: *Perceptio autem experimentalem quamdam notitiam significat. Et hæc proprie dicitur sapientia*. The Mission of the Son, Who is Wisdom, to the soul is not, of course, identical with Wisdom, the Gift of the Holy Ghost; but it is instructive to note the similarity of language and thought.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 6 ad 2.

<sup>83</sup> James, iii, 14. Every best gift and every perfect gift is from above.

<sup>84</sup> II-II, xlv, 1 ad 1.

manner. This a man attains to by the Holy Ghost, as it is written: the spiritual man judges all things; for as it is written in the same place: the Spirit searcheth all things, even the hidden things of God.<sup>94</sup>

How then does Wisdom judge? By kinship, St. Thomas answers, with the things of God:

Right judgment can come in two ways. The one is by the right use of reason, the other by an affinity or sympathy [*connaturalitas quaedam*] to those things on which the judgment is made, as in matters of purity one who knows moral science gives a correct judgment by means of an operation of his reason, but one who is pure gives a correct judgment by means of his affinity to purity. So when it is a question of God, the intellectual virtue of wisdom gives a correct judgment after the reason has made due search, but to judge of God by kinship to him belongs to the Gift of the Holy Ghost, as Denis says: Hierotheus is perfect in the divine knowledge, not only by learning, but also by experiencing divine things. Now this sympathy, this kinship [*hujusmodi compassio sive connaturalitas*] to divine things is the result of charity which unites us to God, as it is written: he who adheres to God is one spirit with him. Thus Wisdom the Gift has its cause, charity, in the will, but its essence in the intellect.<sup>95</sup>

And so it extends over the whole of man's life:

Since Wisdom the Gift is more excellent than wisdom the intellectual virtue, attaining as it does more nearly to God by the soul's union with him, it can direct man *not only in contemplation, but in action.*<sup>96</sup>

But St. Thomas willingly acknowledges with St. Gregory that the first function of Wisdom is to gaze upon God, and that "in contemplation is sought the first beginning, God":

The first care of Wisdom is *the contemplation of divine things*, which is the sight of the Beginning; its second care only is to direct human action according to God's way.<sup>97</sup>

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., corp. art. Ille qui cognoscit causam altissimam simpliciter, quae est Deus, dicitur sapiens simpliciter, etc.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 2 corp. art.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 3 corp. art.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., 3, 3. Gregorius dicit, quod "in contemplatione principium, quod Deus est, quaeritur." . . . Ergo sapientia est contemplativa tantum. (St. Thomas answers): Ad sapientiam prius pertinet *contemplatio divinorum, quae est visio principii*; et posterius dirigere actus humanos secundum rationes divinas.

Wisdom the Gift differs from the acquired intellectual virtue in that the latter can be had in mortal sin, whereas the former only by those in grace, for Wisdom presupposes not only faith but love.<sup>98</sup> It is present in all souls in grace, but, like all the virtues and Gifts, grows as grace and charity grow :

Some only have this right judgment *in contemplation* and in directing human action in so far as is necessary [i.e., strictly necessary] for salvation. This minimum is lacking to no one in a state of grace, for if nature always supplies man with necessary things, much more so does grace. . . . Others receive Wisdom the Gift in a higher degree both *in contemplation*, that is by knowing and being able to show to others some of the deepest mysteries, and in directing others . . . but this degree of Wisdom is not common to all in a state of grace, but approaches to the *gratiae gratis datae*.<sup>99</sup>

And at the end of the Question we come back to the doctrine of the *Pars Prima* on the Missions :

Increased Wisdom first unites himself to us by the gift of charity, and by this reveals to us the mysteries, *knowledge of which is infused wisdom*.<sup>100</sup>

And so the reward of Wisdom the Gift is the seventh beatitude :

They shall be called the sons of God. Men are called sons of God, in so far as they are like the only-begotten, natural Son, as it is written : whom he foreknew to be made like the image of His Son, who is wisdom begotten. *And so*

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., 4 corp. art. Sapientia de qua loquimur praesupponit charitatem.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., 5 corp. art. It should be remembered that although *gratia gratis data* (grace directed to another's sanctification) is formally divided against *gratia gratum faciens* (sanctifying grace), *in concreto* the two are not exclusive. For example, the *fides*, *sermo sapientiae* and *sermo scientiae*, *gratiae gratis datae* possessed so abundantly by a St. Thomas or a St. John of the Cross, both in their bestowal and their exercise helped to sanctify the two great saints—were, in fact, as St. Thomas said above (I, xliii, 6), a divine Mission to the soul. This is particularly the case with Wisdom, because of its intimate connection with charity. *Nemo dat quod non habet*.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., 6 ad 2. Sapientia increata primo se nobis unit per charitatem, et ex hoc revelat nobis mysteria, *quorum cognitio est sapientia infusa*.



*by receiving Wisdom the Gift a man reaches sonship with God.*<sup>101</sup>

What we have said of St. Thomas' doctrine on contemplation can be seen applied *in concreto et in individuo* when he treats of the life of Our Blessed Lord. Let us look for a moment at the article in Question XXI of the *Pars Tertia* where the question is asked: Did Christ pray? St. Thomas puts the objection that whereas prayer is defined as the ascent of the mind to God, all Christians assume that the human mind of Christ was always joined to God in the beatific vision. He answers in a paragraph full of depth:

By ascent, we mean nothing else than a movement towards that which is above. Now, movement is twofold—first, what we strictly speaking mean by the word, that is, the act of an imperfect being passing from potency to act, and this kind of movement is possible only in one who is not actually but only potentially "above" [i.e., he has not yet risen, but *can* rise]. If movement be taken in this sense, "the human intellect of Christ," as St. John Damascene says, needed not to rise to God, for it was ever united to him both by the hypostatic union and *by the contemplation of the blessed.*" But movement can also be used of the action of a perfect being—that is to say, of a being in act—and so to perceive with the senses, or to understand, may be called movement, and in this sense the human intellect of Christ always rises to God, because *it always contemplates him who is above it.*<sup>102</sup>

How then could Christ suffer? For it is admitted that

*the joy of contemplating divine things lessens the sense of pain, and so the martyrs were helped in their sufferings . . . but the soul of Christ had the greatest joy in contemplating God.*<sup>103</sup>

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., corp. art. Et ideo participando donum sapientiae, ad Dei filiationem homo pertingit. Such a tremendous utterance as this is should be pondered by those who think that St. Thomas attached less significance to the Gifts in the *Summa* than in earlier writings.

<sup>102</sup> III, xxi, 1 ad 3.

<sup>103</sup> III, xv, 5, 3. Delectatio contemplationis divinatorum diminuit sensum doloris . . . sed anima Christi summe delectabatur in contemplatione Dei. This is one of the many passages in the *Summa* which equate *contemplatio divinatorum* and *contemplatio Dei*.

St. Thomas answers, and the answer, all proportions guarded, helps us to explain much in the lives of the saints :

By divine power . . . the joy was retained within Christ's mind so as not to flow into the [interior and exterior] senses, and so he could suffer.<sup>104</sup>

But we have not yet done with difficulties. We have decided in the *Pars Secunda* that the contemplative life is superior to the active. What, then, of Our Lord :

Christ while in this mortal life should have led the most perfect life possible. Now the most perfect life is the contemplative life, and for the contemplative life solitude is essential, as it is written : I will lead her into the solitude, and I will speak to her heart.<sup>105</sup>

If we have read our *Pars Secunda* with eyes that saw, we know well enough what St. Thomas' answer will be, but the application in all their depth and breadth to Our Lord of the familiar phrases which have been thought to be a partizan allusion to the Dominican order shows us how fatal it is to see a facile, material meaning in St. Thomas' doctrine. He answers :

The contemplative life is better in every way than an active life of merely external, material action ; but the active life in which one gives to others the fruits of contemplation in preaching and teaching is more perfect than a life engaged solely in contemplation, for the former life presupposes an overflowing abundance of contemplation. Hence it was Christ chose this life.<sup>106</sup>

And this was the reason why He first went into the wilderness and then returned to live among men after His fast :

for it befits the life (which we have said Christ assumed) in which one gives to others the fruits of contemplation, that it should first spend time in contemplation, and then descend into the field of action.<sup>107</sup>

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., ad 3.

<sup>105</sup> III, xl, 1, 2. Readers of St. John of the Cross will recognize the quotation from Osee, ii, 14, so dear to him.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., ad 2.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid., 2 ad 3. Hoc enim convenit vitæ, secundum quam aliquis *contemplata aliis tradit*, quam Christus dicitur *assumpsisse*, ut primo contemplationi vacet et postea ad publicum actionis descendat.

If we pass to consider the manner of Christ's contemplation, we are once more on familiar ground. Our Lord was at once a *comprehensor* and a *viator*; His human soul therefore enjoyed two contemplations, *patriae* and *viae*. The former was exercised through the light which came from the divine nature and the Gifts as they exist in their fullest development in heaven; the latter through infused knowledge by way of the four Gifts "which belong to contemplation in this life,"<sup>108</sup> Wisdom, Understanding, Knowledge and Counsel, and especially of the two first, for "Wisdom gives knowledge of the things of God, and Understanding of all spiritual things,"<sup>109</sup> Christ therefore:

knew all things which God has revealed to men, whether pertaining to the Gift of Wisdom, or to the gift of prophecy or to any other gift of the Holy Spirit.<sup>110</sup>

Christ, therefore, our Head and our Model and the source and cause of all virtue and grace, whether habitual or actual, is presented to us by St. Thomas as the supreme example of the contemplative life, which he exercised, *ut viator*, by the infused knowledge received by the *potentia obedientialis* of his human soul, working by the Gifts.<sup>111</sup> Shall we say of this contemplation, or of that of His Mother, or of that of the Magdalen, that

<sup>108</sup> III, vii, 5. *Utrum in Christo fuerunt dona. 3. Quatuor dona videntur pertinere ad contemplationem viae; scilicet sapientia, scientia, intellectus et consilium.*

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, xl, 1. *sed contra.* Ad sapientiam pertinet cognitio omnium divinorum; ad intellectum autem pertinet cognitio omnium immaterialium.

<sup>110</sup> *Ib.*, corp. art.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.* In anima humana . . . consideratur duplex potentia passiva: una quidem per comparisonem ad agens naturale; alia vero per comparisonem ad agens primum, quod potest quamlibet creaturam reducere in actum aliquem altiozem actu in quem reducitur per agens naturale: et haec consuevit vocari POTENTIA OBEDIENTIAE in creatura. A most important passage. The Gifts of the Holy Ghost are therefore the action of God upon the *potentia obedientiae* and their acts are essentially supernatural. Cf. II-II, lii, 2 ad 1. In donis Spiritus Sancti mens humana non se habet ut movens, sed magis ut mota. All the "passivity" of the great mystics is to be interpreted in the light of these two quotations from the *Summa*. We may recall the words of St. John of the Cross: "Pure contemplation consists in receiving."

it is merely

the brief rest of the mind upon the great verities at which it has arrived by argument and investigation . . . the life of study and passion for truth?

How, then, can we in conclusion sum up in a few words the doctrine we have been considering in extracts? Perhaps it will be clearest to set it out in a series of answers to questions which are undoubtedly at the back, if not at the forefront, of the mind of everyone who approaches the subject.

I. *Is the contemplation of the Summa merely natural philosophical and theological speculation?*

Certainly not. St. Thomas, though taking the analogy from natural contemplation, is describing the *contemplatio sanctorum* and the contemplation of Christ Himself. His contemplation presupposes (in the Christian) faith and charity, and its end is charity; its object is God, the *visio Principii* of St. Gregory and tradition, and the things of God. It is therefore a life, rather than an act; it is, in fact, the intellectual life of a Christian, of a child of God, *formaliter quâ talis*.

II. *Is contemplation, then, common to all Christians?*

Yes, radically, for it springs from principles which all Christians possess, the theological virtues and the Gifts. Hence every soul in charity, *formaliter quâ talis*, can contemplate. But the supernatural life, like the natural, grows and only attains its full development by growing. Moreover, unlike the natural life, supernatural activity (quite apart from its possible destruction or wounding by sin) is grafted upon an organism with pre-existing activities. These latter may continue to be exercised and developed to the all but complete suppression of the supernatural, and a soul may never have emerged from its spiritual infancy after many years "in grace." There are degrees of charity and of the spiritual life which it would be a gross error to confuse or to overlook. St. Thomas knew them well,<sup>112</sup> and the

<sup>112</sup> Cf. especially I-II, lxi, 5 where he distinguishes between "ordinary" virtue, and that of proficients (*tendentes in divinam similitudinem*) and the perfect (*jam assequentes divinam similitudinem*); and II-II, xxiv, 9 where he distinguishes between the charity of *incipientes*, *proficientes* and *perfecti*.

different functions of charity and contemplation in each, but in the *Summa*—and indeed throughout his works—he writes as a theologian who is concerned with the whole supernatural organism of redeemed man, and has no immediate business with individuals, or with the moral and psychological tendencies of mankind.

### III. *Is contemplation in St. Thomas prayer?*

Yes, if we take as our definition of prayer that of St. John Damascene, that it is the raising of the mind to God. St. Thomas repeatedly makes this definition his,<sup>113</sup> and indeed it has been consecrated by the Church's adoption. He also explicitly describes contemplation as a raising of the mind to God. If we supplement this definition by that other of Denis, also accepted by St. Thomas, that prayer is "a giving and uniting of ourselves to God,"<sup>114</sup> and bear in mind that contemplation has its impulse and its end in love, to deny that for St. Thomas contemplation is prayer would be to deprive of meaning all that he wrote on this subject. We must not allow ourselves to be misled by a failure to understand the scope of the Question on Prayer. Prayer (*oratio*), as St. Thomas realized well, is an equivocal term which in its most general sense covers a multitude of actions. Strictly speaking, it does not correspond to any one of the virtues St. Thomas discusses in the *Secunda Secundae*, and many of the acts which we consider typical of prayer, St. Thomas refers primarily to the virtues which elicit them immediately. Thus:

when one gives himself to God, adhering to him by a union of spirit [we recognize the text consecrated to Wisdom the Gift], this is immediately an act of charity; but for one to give himself to God for some work of divine worship [saying or hearing Mass, for example] is immediately an act of the virtue of religion, but is ultimately referred to charity which is the principle of religion.<sup>115</sup>

<sup>113</sup> E.g., for him the Consecration of the Mass "in qua mens maxime debet elevari in Deum" is a prayer (*oratio*). II-II, lxxxiii, 17 corp. art. But the active English term "raising" is not a wholly adequate rendering of *ascensus mentis in Deum* which, as we have seen, does not exclude the contemplation of Christ (and of the mystics).

<sup>114</sup> II-II, lxxxiii, 1, 2 "sicut Deo nosipsos tradentes et unientes."

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., lxxxii, 2 ad 1.

Prayer, therefore, is considered by St. Thomas chiefly in its species of impetratory prayer, though indeed everything in the Christian life links itself to the centre of things, for our principal petition in all prayer is for union with God; and once more he quotes the great contemplative text: *Unam petii a Domino, hanc requiram*.<sup>116</sup> But what we normally understand by the term "contemplative prayer" St. Thomas would consider as an activity of charity in the will, and of the Gifts of Wisdom and Understanding in the intellect directed by charity. And what we still more loosely call "mystical contemplation" St. Thomas would divide according as it proceeded from the light of faith (intensified by the Gifts) or from the light of prophecy which, in its turn, in the case of the just, is based upon the light of faith and may have direct connection with sanctifying grace.

IV. *Does contemplation in the Summa proceed from the Gifts as from immediate efficient principles?*

Most certainly; there are no other principles from which the *contemplatio sanctorum* (i.e., of the just *formaliter quâ tales*) can proceed. The natural intellectual virtues are plainly insufficient for the purpose, they may be *directed* by charity but they are not thereby specifically elevated. Faith, by itself, is likewise insufficient; for it can be present in the soul of one without grace, whereas contemplation proceeds from charity and is directed towards God as loved by charity. The intellectual Gifts therefore alone remain, and, as we have seen, throughout his life and works St. Thomas assumes the Gifts as the basis of the contemplative life, both in Christians and in Christ Himself.

V. *Is the contemplation of the Summa mystical?*

Certainly; if we adopt as our definition of "mystical theology" that current from the time of Denis, which was assumed rather than explicitly discussed by St. Thomas, and finally explicitly defined by St. John of the Cross. But we must bear in mind that any and every derivative and cognate of "mystical" is a *nidus*

<sup>116</sup> Ibid., lxxxiii, 1 ad 2. Hoc praecipue est in oratione petendum ut Deo uniamur, secundum illud: *Unam petii a Domino, hanc requiram*, etc.



*equivocationum*, and that more than half the misunderstandings on the subject of prayer are caused by equivocal uses of words. St. John of the Cross states that

contemplation, whereby the understanding has the loftiest knowledge of God, is called mystical theology, which signifies secret wisdom of God; for it is secret to the very understanding that receives it,<sup>117</sup>

and he is never tired of defining "infused" contemplation as "knowledge with love" or "loving knowledge." This definition is in full accord with the age-long tradition of the Church, crystallized so sublimely by the great John of St. Thomas, which regards as "mystical knowledge" of divine things the knowledge that comes through love—the knowledge in other words that proceeds from Wisdom the Gift as so often described by St. Thomas. But even if we consider only the manner in which this knowledge is imparted by the intellectual Gifts, the "passivity" or rather "receptivity" demanded on the part of the soul (for the Gifts are the action of God upon the *potentia obedientialis*, not upon the natural potency) is exactly that required in the states and prayers currently described as "mystical."

#### VI. *Is the contemplation of St. Thomas that of St. John of the Cross?*

In view of what has been already said, if a monosyllabic answer is demanded to this question, it can only be: Yes. In each case the object—God, the First Truth, as He is in Himself—and the efficient principles—the theological virtues and the Gifts—are the same, and if we set aside all the associations that the *Summa* on the one hand, and the *Dark Night* and *Living Flame* on the other, have for our minds (for the one comes to us first as the cold embodiment of reason and order, and the others as a seraphic sounding of depths and heights far beyond us), and re-read the articles in the *Summa* on Wisdom the Gift and on the connection between Contemplation and Love, alongside one of the many passages in which St. John defines and describes the loving knowledge that comes from union with God, the

<sup>117</sup> *Ascent*, II, viii, §6 (trans. Peers).

fundamental resemblance between the two will stand out and the accidental differences will disappear.

But having said so much, we must hasten to add (what is indeed obvious) that the differences of outlook and treatment between the two Doctors are very great. St. Thomas throughout writes as a speculative theologian concerned solely to exhibit in all its richness the deposit of the faith. In considering the endowments of the human mind, natural and supernatural, he is not thinking of "souls" whether individuals, groups or classes, but of the Christian soul which reproduces, so to say, and derives all its gifts and activities from, the life of Christ. Contemplation, therefore, for him is not primarily regarded as the goal towards which the individual soul must struggle; it is rather the intellectual act in which the Christian *theologus* in the widest sense penetrates, understands and touches the mysteries of faith—the Christian's "second sight" or "inward vision," without which an enumeration of articles and propositions has no light of life—that knowledge which comes from love and whose presence can be detected by others who have that love—*da amantem et sentit quod dico: nonne cor nostrum ardens erat?*—without which what we call speculative theology is, and has so often been, an arid intellectual exercise.

St. John, on the other hand, writes as a guide of souls who himself has found Him whom his heart desired. His aim is practical, and he is addressing simple, unknown souls who are not all wise according to the flesh. He is occupied almost entirely with the means, the discipline to be gone through before the individual can attain; contemplation is no longer a formal act of the abstract human mind elevated by grace, it is the dynamic action of God beating upon the soul, the Light of the World shining in the darkness and dispelling it. It is the practical, living description of that purgation by faith described by St. Thomas when he comments, with seeming coldness, on the Sixth Beatitude: *Beati mundi corde.*<sup>118</sup>

But the differences are obliterated in the life of each saint. To St. Thomas, near the end of his life, the

<sup>118</sup> II-II, vii. Needless to say, the coldness is only apparent.

theology that could be put into words seemed but straw compared to that which filled his soul with infused light. St. John's every page gives evidence of his loving "contemplation" of the mysteries of the faith and of the Scriptures, and it is a fact upon which those with any experience of "contemplative" souls agree that not only does theology, and especially the theology of the central mysteries, become more and more the subject of their contemplation, but that, without study, they are often possessed of a knowledge of divine truth so precise and true as to surprise many a one who has spent, and well spent, the years of preparation for priesthood or for doctorate. This, indeed, is the "mystical theology," the infused Wisdom, which is not hidden from little ones and yet is as a bright light to the wise, the Wisdom which St. Thomas and St. John shared in their measure with the Mother of God, the living water offered alike to the Doctor and to the woman of Samaria, springing up to eternal life. *Optavi, et datus est mihi sensus; invocavi, et venit in me spiritus sapientiae.*<sup>119</sup>

---

NOTE.—On page 10 of the first part of this article, the words *analogatum* and *analogans* should be transposed the second and third times that they occur.

<sup>119</sup> Wisdom vii, 7. The opening words of the Lesson on St. Thomas' feast.

## "AND THE LORD SET A MARK UPON CAIN "

BY THE REV. T. E. BIRD, D.D.

**T**HESE are the generations of Sin " might well be written as the sub-title of the Book of Genesis. Adam and Eve broke the one and only commandment laid upon them. Cain was guilty of fratricide. Lamech calls upon his wives to listen to his boast: " I have killed a man!" The Deluge is brought about by sin. Chanaan is cursed by his own father, because he gazed on Noe's nakedness. The Tower of Babel was to be a monument of pride. Abram is brought away from the idolatry of Ur and Haran. There is strife between his herdsmen and Lot's, so that uncle and nephew have to separate. Sarai is unkind to Agar. Sodom and Gomorrha are destroyed because they were stinking with iniquity; not even ten men could be found there in a state of grace. Moab and Ammon have their origin traced to sin. Esau is a sinner hating his brother. Laban is a trickster. Dina is raped, and her brothers, Simeon and Levi, effect a horrible vengeance. Her, Juda's firstborn, was wicked in the sight of the Lord; and the Lord slew him. Then his brother, Onan, does a detestable thing, and the Lord slew him also. Later, Tharmar, the woman in the case, acts the harlot, and begets the twins Phares and Zara. Joseph is hated by his brethren, who first plot to kill him, but at the instance of Juda he is sold as a slave. In Egypt he is locked up in prison owing to the false evidence of an infatuated woman. It would be hard, indeed, to find a book of the size of *Genesis* with a worse record of crime! It would be well nigh impossible to find a book of national history, written by a man of that nation, with such a black picture of the morals of its ancestors. A confirmatory proof of the inerrancy of Sacred Scripture is surely to be found in the utterly candid and simple account of Old Testament history. God's history book does not gloss over the truth.

In this paper we are concerned with the crime of Cain.

Eve bears a son, whom we call Cain. An editorial note (in all probability) explains the name as due to the mother's cry: "I have *gotten* (Heb. root *qana*) a man with the help of God." But Eve did not speak Hebrew. A better derivation would make Cain the first Mr. *Smith*. Another son was born and given the name Abel (Sumerian word for "son"). The elder followed his father's vocation (iii. 17, 32), while the younger son was given charge of the flocks. Other children were born, whose names are not recorded; for the author of Genesis mentions only those persons on whom his history hangs. (It would be utterly improbable to suppose that no other child was born to Adam and Eve until Seth, who did not see the light before the death of the adult Abel.)

Cain and Abel, in token of their worship of God, offer to Him each a *minha*. In Mosaic times this word became the technical term for the sacrificial grain-offering. But its primary and earliest meaning is simply "a gift" or "a present." Thus, when Jacob gives a present to Esau he gives him a *minha*.<sup>1</sup> A holy gift or present, that is, one made to God, is a *sacrifice*. Every sacrifice is fundamentally a gift offered to God. Outward expression of inward regard naturally takes the form of a gift or present. We make presents to our friends—at Christmas and on birthdays. So when God is loved and revered, the desire to offer Him a gift springs naturally in the human heart. The only acceptable and adequate gift we can make nowadays is the Gift of His Son, whom we offer (or rather, who offers Himself through our priestly ministry) on the Eucharistic altar. But before Christ's sacrifice, God was pleased to accept other gifts—sheep, oxen, corn, fruits, etc. Cain's gift was *fruits of the soil*: Abel's was *the firstlings of his flock*, that is the very best; and not only that, but he offered the choicest parts of the firstlings, namely, *their fat parts*. Abel's devotion was obviously of the highest kind: see Heb. xi. 4.

God accepted Abel's sacrifice and rejected Cain's. How? Some commentators think that fire descended from heaven and consumed the acceptable gift;<sup>2</sup> others say that the smoke of one ascended straight to heaven

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xxxii. 14, 19, 22.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Lev. ix. 24; 3 K. xviii. 38.

while that of the other was dispersed. Better to say simply that the sign of approval and disapproval is not recorded. If we enquire further and ask why God rejected Cain's sacrifice, the best answer is found in Matt. v. 23-24 :

If therefore thou offer thy gift at the altar, and there thou rememberest that thy brother hath anything against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go first to be reconciled to thy brother : and then come and offer thy gift.

Cain offered his sacrifice with sin on his soul, enmity against his brother. " His own works were wicked, and his brother's just."<sup>3</sup>

Seeing that his sacrifice was not acceptable Cain showed sullen disappointment by a long face : *his face fell*. Whereupon God would have him examine his conscience. The difficult verse 7 should probably be rendered : " If thou doest well, should there not be a lifting up [of face]? And if thou doest not well, thou art couching [like a slave or animal] at the door of sin, which desires to get control of thee; but thou shouldst overcome it."<sup>4</sup>

To this merciful admonition Cain turns a deaf ear. He allows himself to be mastered by the temptation, and he plans the murder. First, he must get his brother away to some quiet spot, out of sight of others : *Let us go into the field*. So reads the Septuagint, and rightly. There, in that solitary place, he rose up in hostile attitude towards his brother, and slew him.

As in the case of Adam and Eve (iii. 10-13), God seeks a confession from the murderer : *Where is thy brother Abel?* But instead of confessing, Cain answers insolently and untruthfully : *I do not know. Am I my brother's keeper?* Whereupon God convicts him : *What hast thou done! The voice of thy brother's blood is crying out to me from the soil.* (For the same idea see 4 Kings ix. 26; Job xvi. 18; Is. xxvi. 21; Ezech. xxiv. 7, 8.) Wilful murder is a sin crying out to heaven for vengeance. The blood

<sup>3</sup> I John iii. 12.

<sup>4</sup> See Van Hoonacker in *Expositor*, 1915, p. 453. There is no need to connect the Hebrew *rbs* with Assyrian *rabisu*, a class of demons. The Hebrew verb is commonly used of animals reclining or couching.



of Abel called for vengeance; but the Blood of Christ cries out to Heaven for mercy<sup>5</sup>.

While Abel's blood for vengeance cries,  
What Jesus shed still intercedes  
For those who wrong Him most.

Again, as in iii. 14-19, the curse follows the conviction. Cain is cursed *off the ground* ('adama), that is, he is expelled from the homestead; he must say good-bye to his family; his farming would no longer be profitable. Banished from Eden he is condemned to wander in the open country ('eres). Verse 13 is variously interpreted; we prefer to see in the words a cry of anguish: *My iniquity is too great to be forgiven!*<sup>6</sup> Not only is he to be expelled from his father's home, but he feels that he will be abandoned by God: *From thy face shall I be hidden*. No longer in God's favour, and bereft of His protection, he sees only a violent death is in store for him: *Whosoever shall find me shall slay me!* It would appear, then that Cain was contrite; he feels that his sin is too awful to be forgiven; and bitterly he laments the forfeiture of divine friendship (cp. Deut. xxxi. 18). Away from his kinsfolk he will quickly become a stranger to his brethren; yea, unknown to brothers (like Seth) who were yet to be born. He will be remembered only as the slayer of his brother. Should he be found, a natural instinct to avenge the pious Abel's blood will impel the one who meets him to slay him.<sup>7</sup> But the mercy of God consoles the hapless murderer (cp. iii. 15): *Not so!* Should any-

<sup>5</sup> Heb. xii. 24, 25.

<sup>6</sup> Most modern commentators think that Cain is complaining against the severity of God's sentence on him: *My punishment is too great to be borne*. Against this is the evidence of all the versions: Lxx., Targum ("My iniquity is too great to be pardoned"); Vulg. ("major est iniquitas mea, quam ut veniam merear"); and the fact that the usual meaning of the phrase 'avon nasa is *pardon iniquity*. I doubt, indeed, whether 'avon ever has the simple meaning *punishment*, in spite of the number of passages given in the *Oxford Lexicon*. Perhaps the best rendering of the text is Rashi's, who makes it a question: *Is my iniquity too great to be forgiven?*

<sup>7</sup> Cp. Num. xxv. 19-27; Jos. xx. 3, 5; 2 Kings xiv. 11; Ps. ix. 13.

one kill Cain his death shall be completely avenged.' But still more, no one shall kill Cain.

Here we come to the words that are at the head of this paper. The Vulgate reads: *Posuitque Dominus Cain signum*, which the Douay translates: *And the Lord set a mark upon Cain*, which agrees with the Anglican Authorized Version. Most of the older commentators thought that Cain was marked in some way or other; some suggested that his body was made to shake or tremble; others that his face became so hideous that it would frighten off any aggressor! others that he was branded.<sup>9</sup> Among moderns who favour a corporal marking of the murderer there is little agreement as to the form it took. Sir James Frazer, who seems to delight in holding up the Sacred Books to cheap ridicule, thinks that "the deity may have decorated Cain with red, black or white paint, or perhaps with a tasteful combination of these colours"; and the purpose of the painting, according to the same authority, was not to protect Cain from his kinsfolk, "but from the wrath of his victim's ghost" (!)<sup>10</sup>

Dr. Skinner is at a loss to determine the nature of the marking; he quotes W. Robertson Smith in favour of a "*shart* or tribal mark which every man bore in his person, and without which the ancient form of blood-feud, as the affair of a whole stock and not of near relations alone, could hardly have been worked."<sup>11</sup> Dr. Driver is still more cautious; the mark was attached to Cain's person, "but what it was is not stated, and it is idle to speculate."<sup>12</sup>

I submit that the Hebrew text says nothing about a mark made on Cain's person, but it speaks of a *sign being*

<sup>8</sup> Lit. *it shall be avenged sevenfold*. Not that seven members of the murderer's clan shall be slaughtered (Skinner and others), nor that Lamech, the seventh from Adam, will kill Cain; but simply that seven denotes thoroughness or completeness: cp. Ps. xi. 7; lxxviii. 12; Prov. vi 31; Is. xxx. 26, etc.

<sup>9</sup> I remember two school boys coming to my presbytery at Sutton Coldfield, and asking: "Sister was telling us about God putting a mark on Cain. She did not say what it was. Was he branded like a sheep with a red mark?"

<sup>10</sup> *Folklore of Old Testament*, Vol. I, pp. 100, 86.

<sup>11</sup> *I.C.C. Genesis*, p. 112.

<sup>12</sup> *Book of Genesis*, p. 67.

set for Cain. The three words 'oth (sign), sum (set), le (for) exclude any idea of a bodily impression or incision.

(1) The word 'oth is used dozens of times in the Old Testament but never with the meaning of a mark or impression on the body. The sun and moon are *signs* of the weather.<sup>13</sup> Miracles are *signs*, especially the miracles wrought in Egypt.<sup>14</sup> Prophetic events and proofs of statements are confirmed by *signs*.<sup>15</sup> When the prophet Isaias would deter the impious Achaz from his futile policy he bids him "ask a *sign* ('oth) from Yahwe, thy God, deep down in Sheol or in the height above"; that is, any sort of miracle he desires. And when the sullen agnostic refuses to ask, Isaias turns from him, and addressing the House of David (the throne that is to remain for ever) gives it a sign for all time, a sign from its Lord ('Adonay)—the sign of Immanuel born of a virgin.<sup>16</sup> Had we the Aramaic that underlies "The Gospel of Mary" (Luke i.-ii.) we should find the same word (Aram. 'ath) where the angel says, in proof of his message, "This shall be a *sign* unto you: You shall find a Babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, and lying in a manger" (Luke ii. 12).

Whenever a covenant was made a *sign* was attached to it. The *sign* of the covenant between God and the generation of Noe was the rainbow.<sup>17</sup> The *sign* of the covenant between God and Abraham was circumcision.<sup>18</sup> The sign of the covenant between God and Moses was the

<sup>13</sup> Gen. i. 14; Ps. lxiv. (65) 9.

<sup>14</sup> Ex. iv. 7, 8, 17, 28, 30; vii. 3; x. 1; Deut. xi. 3; Jos. xxiv. 17; Pss. lxxvii. (78) 43; civ. (105) 27; Jer. xxxii. 20; see also Judges vi. 17; Num. xiv. 11; etc.

<sup>15</sup> Ex. iii. 12; Deut. xiii. 3 (Heb.); I K. (Sam.) ii. 34; x. 7, 9; xiv. 10; 4 K. xix. 29; Jer. xlv. 29; etc.

<sup>16</sup> It is well to bear this in mind when discussing the Immanuel prophecy. Rationalists contend that the *sign* must have been something intelligible to Achaz, and apparent in his own day. Quite the reverse! The prophet turns deliberately away from the king who has refused any sign, and addresses himself to the House of David of all time. In a somewhat similar way Our Lord refused to give a *sign* to an "incredulous generation."

<sup>17</sup> Gen. ix. 12, 13, 17.

<sup>18</sup> Gen. xvii. 11.

Sabbath.<sup>19</sup> (In all probability this is the reason why, as a prologue to the Mosaic Law, the Creation was framed into a week, ending in a Sabbath day which God "blessed and hallowed" (Gen. ii. 1-3). The New Covenant was also given its sacred sign, that is, its sacrament, the Holy Eucharist.

To return to *'oth*. The word is used for *ensigns*.<sup>20</sup> The blood of the paschal lamb on the door-posts was a *sign* to the destroying angel.<sup>21</sup> What were afterwards called "tephillin" or phylacteries were also *signs* or reminders of what Yahwe had done for Israel.<sup>22</sup> Now it is here that Skinner and other critics point to *'oth* as meaning a mark or cutting in the body, on the arm and between the eyes. But whatever is meant in Exodus and Deuteronomy (whether something merely figurative, or actual phylacteries), certainly no cuttings into the flesh are intended. The verb *qashar* in Deut. vi. 8; xl. 18, excludes any idea of incisions: the signs were to be *tied* or *bound* on the arm and between the eyes. Indeed, it would have been strange if the Almighty Lawgiver had cut marks into Cain's flesh, since the Law itself expressly prohibited any such markings:

"Ye shall not make any marks (cuttings, *sereth*) in your flesh" (Lev. xix. 28).

"And in your flesh ye shall make no marks" (id.) (Lev. xxi. 5).

Here we see that the word *mark* in the sense of a bodily incision was not *'oth*, but *sereth*. And a mark that was not cut into the flesh, but merely impressed upon it was a *taw*:

"Put a mark (*taw*) on the forehead of the man."

"Come not nigh the man on whom is the mark (*taw*)" (Ezec. ix. 4, 6).

The only other mark that could disfigure a man was the mark of disease (*nega'*), usually the mark of leprosy.

A few more examples will conclude our examination of

<sup>19</sup> Exod. xxxi. 13, 17; Ezec. xx. 12, 20. The Sabbath, of course, ceased to be a sign when the Mosaic dispensation came to an end.

<sup>20</sup> Num. ii. 2; Ps. lxxiii. (74) 4.

<sup>21</sup> Exod. xii. 13.

<sup>22</sup> Exod. xiii. 9, 16; Deut. vi. 8; xi. 18.

'*oth*. The twelve stones which Josue placed in the Jordan were *signs*, that is, memorial stones of the crossing of the river.<sup>23</sup> The censers which Eleazar took, by command of Moses, and beat into plates to cover the altar were *signs*.<sup>24</sup> The pillar which Isaias sees erected in Egypt is also a *sign*;<sup>25</sup> as also is the iron plate on which Ezechiel demonstrated the siege of Jerusalem.<sup>26</sup>

From all this it is clear that '*oth* does not mean anything more than a *sign*.

(2) The verb used in Gen. iv. 15 is *sim* (*sum*) that is *put*, *set* or *place*. When elsewhere we find this verb used with the noun '*oth* it does not mean that a sign was attached to a person. A few examples will bear this out:

"My *signs* which I have *put* among them."<sup>27</sup>

"His *signs* that he *did* in Egypt."<sup>28</sup>

"They *set* among them the words of his *signs*."<sup>29</sup>

"Thou didst *set signs*."<sup>30</sup>

"And I will *put* a *sign* among them."<sup>31</sup>

(3) Had a mark been put on the body of Cain we should expect to find the preposition '*al*, not *le*, as in the text before us. A few passages will suffice to illustrate this: "Pharao *put* a chain of gold on ('*al*) Joseph's neck",<sup>32</sup> the Presence bread is "*put upon* ('*al*) the pure table",<sup>33</sup> the brazen serpent is "*put upon* a standard."<sup>34</sup>

The wording of the text then in Gen. iv. 15 argues strongly against any idea of a mark put upon Cain's body. Indeed, we may further ask whatever purpose

<sup>23</sup> Jos. iv. 6, 7.

<sup>24</sup> Num. xvii. 3 (Heb.).

<sup>25</sup> Is. xix. 20.

<sup>26</sup> Ezech. iv. 3.

<sup>27</sup> Exod. x. 2.

<sup>28</sup> Ps. lxxvii. (78) 43.

<sup>29</sup> Ps. civ. (105) 27.

<sup>30</sup> Jer. xxxii. 20.

<sup>31</sup> Is. lxvi. 19.

<sup>32</sup> Gen. xli. 42.

<sup>33</sup> Lev. xxiv. 6.

<sup>34</sup> Num. xxi. 8, 9. Not "set it up for a sign" (Douay), but "upon a standard (*nes*)."

would be served by such a mark? It would brand him as the murderer. Had its purpose been to warn men not to kill him, this would have been far better effected by God speaking to Adam and to any others of his relatives that might be alive at the time. But as it is, the conversation is simply between God and Cain.

So the words of the sacred text mean that God gave a sign or an assurance to Cain that he should not die a violent death. The Anglican Revisers were justified in rendering the passage: "And the Lord appointed a sign for Cain, lest any finding him should smite him." And the excellent Bonn Bible, still in the course of publication and compiled by the best Catholic Scripture scholars of Germany, correctly translates: "Und Jahve machte für Kain ein Zeichen, dass ihn nichte jeder, der ihn fände, totschlüge."<sup>35</sup>

Leaving his father's home and land, where God was wont to reveal Himself to man, Cain went to the land of Nod, that is, to wanderer's land, east of Eden. Geographical identification is impossible. He married his sister. The *Book of Jubilees* (iv. 9) gives her name as 'Awan, probably an adaptation of the Hebrew word 'awon meaning *iniquity*. According to another tradition she was Cain's twin sister.<sup>36</sup> She conceived and bore Henoch. As the text stands in iv. 17 we must understand that Cain was the builder of a town; not that he actually built a whole town, but that he began to build (lit. *was building*) a town, which his descendants completed. Possibly the original text made Henoch the builder: he is the last person mentioned before the verb, and the analogy of similar passages suggests that after the statement of Henoch's birth, something that *he* did was put on record. But textually the only support for this is Grabe's collation of the Codex Cottonianus. It would seem, however, that the sacred writer, as is his wont, about to leave aside the line of Cain, has in mind what his descendants did. In other words, the name becomes collective and is no longer personal. The wanderer settled down at last at a place where later his descendants had their own town or city.

<sup>35</sup> *Das Buch Genesis*, von. Paul Heinisch, p. 146.

<sup>36</sup> *Pirke R. Eliezer*.



## THE CONVERSION OF CHARLES I

BY THE REV. PHILIP HUGHES, Lic.Sc.Hist.

**T**HERE are few periods of our domestic Church History about which so little has been written as the hundred years or so which lie between the accession of James I and the coming to London of Dr. Richard Challoner. It is not that the century is lacking in personalities. To say nothing of the martyrs, and to restrict ourselves to the secular clergy, there were bishops like William Bishop, Richard Smith, John Leybourne and Bonaventure Giffard and the northern Vicar Apostolic, James Smith, for whom James II vainly petitioned a cardinal's hat, and whose silver crozier is among the show pieces of the treasury of York Minster. There were the great Presidents of Douay, the mighty Matthew Kellison, the obstinate and fiery George Leybourne, and Edward Paston. There were theologians like Edward Hawarden, controversialists like John Sergeant. There was that tough philosophical heretic Thomas White, alias Blackloe. There was John Gother. Yet this great century, which saw the terrible storms of 1641, 1678 and 1688, which produced the men who formed such later champions as Edward Dicconson, Alban Butler and Richard Challoner, still goes without its chronicler. Do the ghosts of the ancient controversies still walk, and too many questions lead back to those silent waters, untroubled for now two centuries, beneath which lies the unsalvaged memory of Bishop Richard Smith? Chi sa? This paper has a humbler rôle than the unravelling of any such tangled skein. It merely offers to those whom the subject of seventeenth-century Catholicism may attract a piece of information not, as far as I know, hitherto available. It is a rough and ready description of an unchronicled incident in the relations between the Holy See and England during the reign of Charles I—rough and ready because the precise incident was not the writer's real business when chance threw him across the track of the documents which relate it. They are contained principally, and all may read them there, in Cod. Lat. 8656 of the Barberini Library now the property of the Holy See and

housed in the Vatican Library.<sup>1</sup> And the story they tell. . . .

In the October of 1633 a Scottish Catholic gentleman, Sir Robert Douglas, cousin to the Earl of Angus,<sup>2</sup> arrived in Rome on a mission as unexpected as it was important. He was charged, on the part of Henrietta Maria, to ask an audience of the Pope, Urban VIII, and to put before him the earnest desire of Charles I to enter into permanent relations with the Holy See. The King was so favourably inclined to Catholics that his conversion was not impossible. Meanwhile, it would assist the good work if one of his subjects was created Cardinal, and as a person suitable in every way the Queen proposed George Conn, Canon of S. Lorenzo in Damaso and gentiluomo to the Cardinal Secretary of State, Francesco Barberino, the Pope's own nephew. This was no private mission, for, in addition to a testimonial letter from his cousin, Douglas was the bearer of official letters of credence under the seal of Scotland, signed by the Scottish Secretary of State, the Earl of Stirling.<sup>3</sup>

The Cardinal Secretary of State was frankly puzzled. What real power had Henrietta Maria? She was not even crowned. Might it not be a manœuvre of Richelieu to obtain indirectly another Francophile Cardinal through the French-born English Queen? Also, the Pope, in the coming consistory, did not intend to create any Cardinals *ad istanza di Principi*, nor would he wish to grant a favour such as this to the English Queen which could be used as a precedent by the Queen of Hungary. The Pope, when informed of the mission, so Douglas thought, would be astonished but would convince himself that it

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise stated this is the authority for all the assertions made in what follows.

<sup>2</sup> Sir William Douglas (1589-1660), eleventh Earl of Angus, first Marquis of Douglas. His father, the tenth Earl, was a Catholic, but he himself was forcibly educated in the new religion. He spent several years after his succession to the earldom (1611) in France and Italy, was something of a scholar, and on his return to Scotland remained suspect as a Papist as long as he lived. Whence a world of trouble between him and the local presbyteries. Cf. D.N.B.

<sup>3</sup> Sir William Alexander (1567[?]-1640), first Earl of Stirling, the most distinguished Scotsman of his time, Secretary of State for Scotland from 1626 until his death, and the country's real ruler. Cf. D.N.B.

was no plot, no matter of human interests, but a direct road to the conversion of the King and his realms. The best elements in the kingdom, Douglas explained, were working for the King's conversion and it was now essential to appoint some confidential agent to speed up the affair without its coming to light.

It was not for the first time that the likelihood of the English King's conversion had been discussed at Rome. There had been, for example, that very year, the scheme of the Capuchin Fr. Zachary of Saluzzo. Zachary of Saluzzo and Charles had met in Spain ten years earlier, at the time of the then Prince of Wales' romantic attempt to win himself a Spanish wife by more personal tactics than those of recognized diplomacy. He had interested the Prince sufficiently for Charles to recall him when, some years later, Capuchins of the Paris province came to London to serve as his wife's chaplains. More than once he had asked for news of him and whether there was a chance of his coming to England. In May, 1632, Fr. Zachary asked Propaganda to allow him to go to England and to give him the necessary faculties. The Sacred Congregation, with its usual slow caution, sounded the Nuncios at Paris and at Brussels, and found out from them that the presence of an Italian Capuchin who would be *persona grata* with Charles would not be welcome to the French Capuchins. Nevertheless, the Nuncios thought the mission would be useful for Catholicism generally, even though the King's conversion—about which they were not at all optimistic—was never achieved. The difficulty of avoiding a rupture with the Queen's chaplains could perhaps be avoided if Fr. Zachary went incognito as one of the household of the Duke of Savoy's ambassador. At this moment (April, 1633) the French Provincial of the Capuchins, Fr. Leonard of Paris, was in Rome for the General Chapter and him, too, the Congregation decided to consult.

Fr. Leonard replied in form. No one could be more suitable for such a mission than Fr. Zachary. But he must on no account go as one of the Queen's chaplains. Their number had been fixed at eight by the marriage treaty, and it had also been laid down that they must be French or at any rate subjects of the French King. Nor should the Sacred Congregation lose sight of the

important fact that, for all the English King's undoubted freedom from vice, he clung fanatically to the idea that, so long as a man believed in Christ, he could save his soul in whatever religion he was born, baptized and bred. To turn him from this notion would be difficult indeed.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, it must be borne in mind—and here the French Capuchin shows himself better acquainted with English affairs than had been, alas, some of the Holy See's more important advisers—that though England is a monarchy, it is an aristocracy by its constitution. All depends on what they call the Parliament. Even though the King himself wishes to become a Catholic it is not certain that he could bring it about. He has not in the whole country any military force to defend his rights against seditions. Should he venture anything in this matter of religion without the Parliament's knowledge, or against its will, his very life would be in danger. Hence it is that, for all his known affection for the Capuchins, the King is most careful never to meet them or to speak with them.<sup>5</sup> Finally, Fr. Leonard doubts whether the time is really suitable. So long as Charles has a hope of recovering the Palatinate,<sup>6</sup> by means of the princes through whom he has already regained so much, he will not change his religion. To do so would seem a preparation for deserting his allies and he would lose all.<sup>7</sup> If, nevertheless, the mission is to go forward it would be worth more to try and convert the Bishop of London (Laud) than the King, for Laud is well disposed towards the Catholic faith and enjoys great influence with the King.

<sup>4</sup> A marginal note in the handwriting of the Secretary of Propaganda, Mgr. Francis Ingoli, reads: "For this reason alone Fr. Zachary should be sent, that as soon as possible he may rid the King's mind of this error."

<sup>5</sup> Ingoli brushes aside this astonishingly acute analysis which the events of the next sixteen years were to justify to the letter. "Human difficulties should not be allowed so to weigh as to put off or delay the missions. From the Church's history we can learn that the conversion of Kingdoms was always brought about in the face of grave difficulties."

<sup>6</sup> i.e., for the children of his sister Elizabeth: it had been lost to the family since the great Catholic victory of the White Mountain in 1621.

<sup>7</sup> "On the contrary. Now that we have this Bishop of London so favourably inclined we should not delay this mission any longer." Ingoli's marginal note.

The Sacred Congregation, however, had decided (May 11th, 1633) against the opinion of Fr. Leonard and for that of the Nuncios, its official sources of information. Fr. Zachary was given permission to go to England and bidden to apply to the Holy Office for faculties.\*

Fr. Zachary was, however, to go to England as a simple missionary, and not as Chaplain to the Ambassador of Savoy, "lest it should seem that the Sacred Congregation approved of Catholic princes sending ambassadors to heretics." (He may, if he likes, live with the Ambassador.) For the same reason the request of the Spanish Ambassador for four Capuchins to live in his house, even as simple missionaries, is refused. There are already ten Capuchins with the Queen, and now Fr. Zachary. If another four are allowed to go it may seem suspicious to the King and his ministers and bring about the expulsion of all the Capuchins. For this reason, too, the Pope warns Fr. Zachary that should his stay in England seem likely to rouse much suspicion and danger, he is to leave. *Acta*, S.C.P.F. 13th June, 1633.

The reports which were coming in from England had been for long most encouraging—always excepting those of the bitter quarrels which divided the Catholics themselves. The Dean of Lincoln had died a Catholic, and news had come of a conversation between his doctor and the King from which it appeared that Charles was not very far from the Faith. Another correspondent had sent news of a discussion in which the King had refuted the popular calumnies of the doctrine of Indulgences, had expressed his own belief in it, and defended the Inquisition. A minister who had spoken insultingly of the Pope in a sermon had been imprisoned, and another too who had prayed for the Queen's conversion to Puritanism. Everywhere the Puritans were being repressed. A magistrate of Salisbury had been very heavily fined for breaking the windows of a church on which were painted pictures of the saints. In Scotland the King's recent visit had resulted in the restoration of more than one Catholic practice (the sign of the cross in Baptism, for example); while at Oxford a great deal

\* The authorities for the incident of Fr. Zachary are (1) the *Acta* of the S.C.P.F. Congregations of 31st May, 1632; 12th April, 1633; 11th May, 1633; and 13th June, 1633. (2) Fr. Zachary's letter of 18th March, 1633, in Prop. Archives *Lettere Antiche*, Vol. 132, f. 157. (3) The Nuncios' replies, of Paris, in *ib.*, Vol. 133, f. 8; of Brussels, in *ib.*, Vol. 74, f. 138. (4) Fr. Leonard's *Responsio* in *ib.*, Vol. 133, f. 155 seqq.



was being done in the way of reforming the ritual, and all in a Catholic spirit. These changes were all due to the influence of the Bishop of London—Laud. There was even talk of a synod to define the meaning of Queen Elizabeth's XXXIX articles.

While Puritanism was more than ever out of favour at Court, and the State Church beginning to present a more Catholic appearance in its ceremonial, the lot of the Catholics themselves had improved enormously. The persecution had ceased entirely as far as the priests were concerned. The King had recently freed an imprisoned priest at the Queen's request, and if the laity were still heavily fined this was not from hatred of Catholicism, but simply because the King needed every pound he could lay his hands on. The Catholics in London were going unmolested to the Queen's Chapel and to the chapels of the different Catholic ambassadors. More than 10,000 had visited the Altar of Repose in the Spanish Ambassador's Chapel in Holy Week, and over a thousand assisted every Sunday at the sermons preached in one chapel or another.<sup>9</sup>

To crown all had now come this mission of Robert Douglas, a further evidence and the best of all perhaps, that behind the favourable signs so carefully reported to Rome there lay a solid hope of substantial change. And yet. . . . The Cardinal Secretary's experienced suspicion still worked, and he determined to consult his even more experienced colleague, the Cardinal di Bagno.

Gianfrancesco dei Conti Guidi di Bagno, Cardinal-Priest of St. Alessio, was ending his long and distinguished career in quasi-retirement as Bishop of Cervia—a tiny see on the Adriatic, long since incorporated with Ravenna. He had served as Nuncio at Brussels for six years (1621-27) and at Paris for three (1627-30), and since the Nuncio at Brussels had England within his sphere of observation,<sup>10</sup> and the Nuncio at Paris was actually the

<sup>9</sup> This account of Rome's idea of the prospects in England is a summary of the information sent to Propaganda in the twelve months preceding Douglas's arrival: some of it through the Nuncio at Paris, some through Cardinal Bentivoglio. The references are (1) *Acta*, S.C.P.F. for 15th March, 1632; (2) *Lettere Antiche*, V. 133, f. 22, 23; (3) *Anglia*, 347, ff. 289-292.

<sup>10</sup> *Acta*, S.C.P.F. (March, 1622), Vol. I, ff. 3-5.



Ordinary for English Catholicism,<sup>11</sup> it was elementary prudence to seek his advice on this new development in English affairs. In these letters he shows himself as shrewd and far seeing as the practical diplomat he was might have been expected to be. The correspondence might well serve as a model for those whose lot it is forever to defer assent to the demands of the influential, and who must yet retain their all-important goodwill. The reader is halted in every letter with admiration for the supple dexterity of the Bishop of Cervia. What a pleasant hobby the little diocese must have been for his green old age! It was to di Bagno, moreover, that Lord Stirling's letter was addressed. Ten years before, in the time of Pope Gregory XV, Stirling had been the intermediary through whom James I and di Bagno, then Nuncio at Brussels, were in correspondence.<sup>12</sup>

Di Bagno took time before he replied (29th October, 1633). To create an English Cardinal would, he agreed, be an encouragement for the English Catholics. Would it really assist the King's conversion? He did not think so. This idea had no better foundation than the credulity of Douglas or his principals. The real question, however, was to find out what underlay these requests. Something more than Douglas's account was needed as evidence before making a decision. On the other hand, Douglas must be satisfied that the Holy See was alive to the importance of his mission, and that it desired nothing more ardently than to give him full satisfaction. With regard to the point whether Douglas's story was to be believed the only real way to be sure was to send to England, and immediately, some disinterested person who could get the story from the Queen's own lips. French secretaries—and hers are French—are quite capable of forgery. The envoy could himself interview different personages of the Court and observe the general trend of affairs. The reason for his presence in England could be camouflaged. He might nominally be there "to reconcile the English Catholics," or simply as an

<sup>11</sup> Decree of the Holy Office, 23rd July, 1615, in Prop. Arch. Anglia, I, f. 245.

<sup>12</sup> In *Cod. Barb. Lat.*, 8619, ff. 91-2, is an interesting letter from the English Poor Clares of Gravelines, asking that an agent be sent to James I, now (c. 1624) old and ailing. The Pope's thought for his salvation may move the King.

act of courtesy in return for the Queen's own courtesy in sending an envoy to the Holy Father. Conn would fill the post admirably, except that since a Cardinal's hat for one of Charles's subjects is one aim of Douglas's mission, and since Conn is himself named for the hat, he would be too interested a party for his report to be above suspicion. Douglas could not but be satisfied returning thus from his mission, and the delay in creating the Cardinal could be easily explained. In the first place, the insults to the Holy See printed and published in England, then the non-observance of the marriage treaty, and finally the cruel persecution of the Catholics were all so many good reasons why the Pope should refuse to trouble himself about such a matter. Nevertheless, because of Douglas's persuasiveness, and for the good he is assured will come of it, the Pope would give the matter his most earnest consideration. Nor need such a declaration from the Pope really compromise his action. It did not really tie his hands, for it in no way bound him to any precise time nor to any special person. The Queen's nomination could not be allowed immediately or His Holiness would lose the credit with the English Catholics for this English nomination. Also the other queens would be jealous.

Cardinal di Bagno's reply is really in two parts, and with the second he sends on a letter he has received from Douglas himself, and one from Douglas's confidant at the Roman Court, the Capuchin Alexander of Hales, through whom, before Douglas had reached Italy, he had already heard of the mission. The entry of yet another Capuchin is a reminder of the great part which that order played in the ecclesiastical diplomacy of the century which followed the Council of Trent.<sup>13</sup> As one turns the leaves of the voluminous correspondence of that century in the archives of Propaganda, letters from every part of the world, the Capuchin missionaries and agents seem omnipresent. There is not a country from Scotland to Persia and Abyssinia where they are not working, whence they are not reporting to this new Roman G.H.Q. of the

<sup>13</sup> The career of Fr. Joseph—"Son éminence grise"—the confidential advisor of Richelieu, is too well known to need more than a mention in this connection. There is more than one reference in these papers to the embarrassment his supposed diplomatic activities caused the Capuchin missionaries in England.

missions. Who Fr. Alexander of Hales was I have never been able to trace. He stood very high in the favour of the Emperor Ferdinand II (1619-37), and was greatly esteemed by di Bagno who had employed him, with his fellow religious Fr. Hyacinth, in the negotiations of 1622-3 with James I. In 1631-2 he had gone to Spain and to England, too, on a diplomatic mission from the Emperor, and Propaganda had then refused his demand for faculties as it was a fixed principle with the Congregation not to give a missionary status to regulars employed in secular diplomacy, lest its own missionaries should fall under suspicion and be expelled.<sup>14</sup> From England he had sent a valuable memorandum on the state of the Church there, and on Douglas' arrival in Rome he had undertaken to promote his case. Whence his letter to Cardinal di Bagno. It was through Fr. Alexander that, so far, Cardinal Barberino had treated with Douglas. Fr. Alexander maintained that it was the King who was really interested and not the Queen, for Henrietta Maria was somewhat frivolous where religion was concerned. This last point di Bagno confirmed.

The affair dragged on for the next three months, Barberino unable to make up his mind, and unwilling to see Douglas much less allow him an audience with the Pope before he had decided on his course of action. Douglas meanwhile—"something of a firebrand," says di Bagno—champed impatiently, full of hints that delays would change Charles from his purpose. Whereupon Barberino's doubts returned in force. If the King could be so easily changed how could they ever trust him? He still clung to the idea that Douglas should be delayed in Rome while an agent went secretly to England to find corroboration for his assertions. Upon one thing the Cardinal was quite determined. He would not make it easier for Charles to do as Elizabeth had done, make use of Catholics for diplomatic purposes while she continued to persecute them. A Cardinal from among his own subjects could always be useful to an heretical prince.

Di Bagno, too, did not change his opinion that someone should be sent privately to England. But he urged very strongly that Douglas should be told frankly who was

<sup>14</sup> *Acta*, S.C.P.F., 25th November, 1631.

going and why. If he wished he could go to England with the envoy or await in Rome his return. To send someone without his knowledge would most certainly offend him mortally. As to Charles' motives the prospect of an English Cardinal would not in itself move him. He was not that kind of a man. But he might be trying what he could do through the Holy See for the restoration of his nephew's dominions. Charles' motives—the Cardinal notes very shrewdly—as all who know him at all will admit, are beyond all guessing. This question of the Palatinate had for long been the King's chief anxiety. It had played its part in the marriage schemes. It had led to the peace with Spain and to a succession of embassies to the Emperor, to Brussels and to Spain, in which ridiculous diplomacy, too, Fr. Alexander had been employed. No doubt the King's sister was once more pressing him and he was trying to use the Pope's influence with the Emperor and with Bavaria. He would like an English Cardinal to work the affair for him, for there might be a chance of that Cardinal's being sent to Germany as legate to make the peace.

So far the diplomat. But di Bagno was at least equally the Catholic bishop, and the letter ends with the reminder that nothing must be done to impede what may be the working of God's grace in the soul of the English King. We must beware of being blamed in this matter for being over sceptical as Clement VII (*sic!*) is blamed to-day for being over severe with Henry VIII.

The next problem was whom to send on this confidential mission, and how best to send him so that no suspicion would fall on Douglas. The Provincial of the fathers of Somaschi "il Padre Vigier da Lilla"<sup>15</sup> was named and it was suggested that he should go to England as though sent by the Nuncio at Paris—Cardinal Bichi—then about to return to Rome on the expiration of his term. Whoever went should go as from Bichi, who could give him his instructions *viva voce*. Di Bagno suggested, too that it might be as well if Fr. Alexander accompanied the proposed envoy. "As he is known to be in the Emperor's confidence Spanish suspicion would be disarmed should they smell out this mission and in their usual way read into it a sinister meaning."

<sup>15</sup> *Barb. Cod. Lat.*, 8656, f. 124.

Douglas finally was received and first of all by the Cardinal Secretary of State on January 7th, 1634—nearly three months after his first coming to Rome. He was told, in very general terms, that one of Charles' subjects would be made a Cardinal, but that the choice must be left entirely to the Pope. After some discussion Douglas agreed to this. Nothing apparently was said of the Cardinal's plan to send an envoy to England to test the seriousness of Charles' proposals, but, in his letter to di Bagno, the Cardinal Secretary notes that Douglas' suspicions about the mission to England have not disappeared. Fr. Alexander was present at the audience. It might be a good plan (in order to console Douglas somewhat) to send him to Vienna with instructions to see if the Emperor showed any disposition to make peace. As Douglas goes North he might call at Cervia. Douglas it appeared later was really anxious for someone to be sent from Rome to Germany "for reasons," says Barberino, "that can be easily imagined." Whereupon Fr. Alexander was suggested, who showed some dislike for the plan. His superiors, he explained, were a little restive at his continuous wandering, and he could not think of a convenient pretext to cover his new mission. Could di Bagno suggest one?

A month later (February 11th, 1634) all had been arranged and Douglas left Rome, still bristling at the memory of the first long delays, but on the whole seemingly satisfied. There was to be an English Cardinal. Fr. Alexander was to go to Germany to work for the children of the Elector Palatine. An envoy, so he now was told, was to go from Rome to England to enquire into the real causes of the dissension among the clergy. The Queen was to have an agent at Rome and the Pope would send one to the Queen. To his specific requests, however, the Pope had given little more than general assents.<sup>16</sup> He was, however, commissioned to ask for the abolition of the Pursuivants, the lessening of the taxes and fines paid by the Catholics, and to ask the King if he would agree to one or more bishops being sent to organize the Church and end the long disputes, the Pope allowing him to say to the King that from these disputes the most serious harm might easily come—*i.e.*, the main-

<sup>16</sup> f. 175 is the note of these with the Pope's comments in the margin.



tenance of two permanent factions within the kingdom by foreign powers.

Douglas returned to England, calling at Cervia on his way. Fr. Alexander went to Vienna as had been promised. It remained to choose the envoy to Charles. Of Gregorio Panzani, who was finally appointed (and whom Cardinal Bichi was, according to plan, ordered to instruct and especially in the matter of the Cardinalate "*negotiato dal Signore Douglas*"),<sup>17</sup> of Conn who was named as agent to die prematurely in his thirties, and of Rosetti who succeeded him, their voluminous and scarcely explored correspondence (1634-1641) tells at length. They still await their historian.

They did not ever convert King Charles I, nor did any other of the numerous Catholic ecclesiastics who moved so freely about the Court of his Queen. But to the very end the hopes endured as witness the letter of yet another Franciscan—an Observant this time—Gilles Chaissy, with which I bring this long paper to an end. Chaissy in 1644 was a man sixty years of age,<sup>18</sup> the last twenty of which he had spent as a missionary in England among the aristocracy.<sup>19</sup> He seems to have been in continual correspondence with Rome although so few of his letters survive. One of them asks permission to abridge the Mass to the Canon! In a much later letter<sup>20</sup> he asks for a renewal of faculties and of the pension due to him. Finally, in a letter of October 28th, 1653,<sup>21</sup> in obedience to an order from Propaganda, he sends a long account of his connection with the English mission. He was a native of Avignon and had no less a personage than Richelieu for a patron. The Cardinal knew his worth as a preacher and controversialist, and paid the expenses of the publication of his first books. It was at the request of Louis XIII and at Richelieu's persuasion that he had first come to England as Almoner and First Preacher to Henrietta Maria on her marriage. He seems to have seen a great deal of Charles and to have had special oppor-

<sup>17</sup> *Cod. Barb. Lat.*, 8111, ff. 72 seq.

<sup>18</sup> *Chaissy to Rosetti*, Vat. Archives Nunz. Inghilterra, 4, f. 178.

<sup>19</sup> *Chaissy to S.C.P.F.*, 15th May, 1647, *ib.*, f. 131, 2.

<sup>20</sup> *Chaissy to S.C.P.F.*, 1653, Archives Prop., V. 297, f. 177.

<sup>21</sup> Prop. Archives Lett. Antiche, 297, ff. 194-197 verso.



tunities of noting the King's interest and skill in religious controversy, and they found a common interest in the study of Aristotle's *Physics*. At the King's suggestion he had written a *Compendium of the Physics*, another of Proclus on the *Physics* and, upon the appearance of a new edition of Pomponazzo *De Immortalitate Animae*, a commentary on Avicenna to show, against Averroes and Pomponazzo that Aristotle teaches the immortality of the soul. Later he had taken part in the anti-Socinian conference at (?) Woodstock, again at the King's request and with the permission of the Nuncio at Paris. When with the summoning of the Parliament in 1640 the anti-Catholic elements returned to power he had been forced into hiding, and his career as a theologian at Oxford figured among the accusations which sent Laud to his death in 1645. Chaissy was alleged to be the agent through whom the Cardinal's hat had been offered to Laud as the price of his conversion. Later, when the war was ended and Charles the prisoner of Parliament, he was able more than once to get to the King's presence as the then French ambassador can testify. He was still near to the King when the fatal 30th of January dawned. "Tres circiter horas ante fatalem obitum chartulam paraveram, qua Regiam Maiestatem ad Animae Suae salutem sedulo cohortabor, sed prudentissimis rationibus (humanis tamen) dissuadebant multi, ne id Regi Coroneaque haeredibus in posterum damno verteret."<sup>22</sup>

They are the last references to that zeal for the King's conversion which filled the minds of so many of these sons of St. Francis, a zeal and devotion—with what prayers who can say—which followed him to the scaffold itself. Charles died as he had lived, the most loyal of all the children of the Church as by Law Established. But his daughter Henrietta and the two sons who succeeded him upon the throne died, all of them, in that faith which Friars, Nuncios and Popes had hoped might reward that spotless life which for his wondering contemporaries made of Charles a King apart.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>22</sup> *ib.*, ff. 197, 197v.

<sup>23</sup> A last word on Cardinal di Bagno: in *Lett. Antiche*, V. 134, ff. 156-7, there is a letter from him to Cardinal Antonio Barberino (4th July, 1634), with a project to restore the Bishopric of Sodor and Man, since in the Island there are 10,000 Catholics!

## DON BOSCO

BY ALICE CURTAYNE.

WERE I to tell the story of Saint John Bosco, I think that I should tell it backwards. I should begin with the dying combatant, the gladiator of Christianity, in that attic room in Turin, upon which the sorrowful eyes of Catholic Europe were focussed. I should tell of how that death-scene filled the thoughts of his Salesian sons in a thousand institutions scattered over five Continents; of how there knelt at his pillow one of his missionaries just back from Patagonia; and of how the last news that was whispered in his ears was a telegram from Ecuador, announcing the safe arrival of the Salesians at Guayaquil.

Don Bosco's is really an incredible story of achievement, and one could expand into an epic a paragraph like the following:

"At the present time the Salesians have no fewer than ten missions in South America (amongst these the leper hospitals in Colombia and Venezuela); nine missions in Asia, from Jerusalem to Japan; four missions in Africa; two in Australia. One thousand five hundred and seventy-two members of the three chief branches of the Order (priests, sisters, assistants) work in these various missions. Besides these there are in civilized Europe and in the United States 463 institutions for boys, 551 for girls, and these institutions are administered by 6,668 priests and assistants, and 5,430 sisters. For the training of all these workers in the service of charity the Order possesses twenty-eight schools and seminaries. . . ."

It is difficult to realize that all this vast and complex organization was originated in his own lifetime by a little peasant boy from Becchis, who was born with the tormented soul of a missionary. He began his education without books, for he had none, by memorizing only, as was the way of the ancient before books came into being. His feats of memorizing almost startled his widowed mother and made her think deeply; these feats merely amused the country neighbours, as any freakish thing amuses.

It was the parish priest, Don Giuseppe Calosso, who gave young John Bosco his chance in life, and this to me is the most moving episode in the whole story. He was walking home from a mission sermon with a great crowd of people from three or four adjoining parishes, and all the way home he played games with the other boys, those lively and exuberant Italian children, whose limbs are never still unless while they are asleep. Young John, aged eleven, was perfectly made and had a turn for acrobatics; he could whirl in Catherine wheels longer and

more perfectly than the rest, until he really looked like a gyrating wheel, provoking shouts of laughter from his companions; he could clear ditches at a bound; he could walk on his hands. Thus the boys scampered and tumbled homewards, shouting and screaming, with an occasional admonition from their elders. The parish priest was on the road too, walking stiffly, for he was aged. He shook his head good-humouredly at the wild gambols of the lads, and sighed when he thought of the earnest preacher whom they had just left. How much had these rascals understood? Suddenly he grabbed one of them, the ringleader of the games, and began to catechize him with a show of sternness:

"You, boy, where are you from?"

"Becchis, Father."

"And your name?"

"Giovanni Bosco."

"Were you at the sermon this evening?"

"Yes, indeed, Father."

"Did you understand anything at all of what the preacher was saying?"

"I understood every word, Father."

The other boys had gathered around, grinning and pinching. The elders were listening too with a smile, for the parish priest had got hold of the widow Margherita's son, and they all knew that the boy would astonish him.

"Look here," said the priest, pulling two pennies from his pocket, "I will give you these if you tell me only four words of the sermon to-day."

The boy planted his bare feet firmly in the dusty road, hitched up his belt and faced Don Giuseppe with a sudden look of gravity.

"Which sermon, Father?" (For there had been two.)

"H'm. So you listened to the two? Well, what was the first one about?"

"We were told not to put off repentance but to take care in good time to save our souls."

"Very good. But can you remember, *word for word*, one sentence spoken by the priest?"

"Yes, Father. Shall I say the first, second, or third part?" (Young John was already quite familiar with the classical method of church oratory.)

"Anything you like."

And then, to his profound astonishment, the parish priest heard the boy repeat the whole sermon, word for word, from beginning to end. And the boy not only repeated it, but he declaimed it too, with considerable effect, lost in a sudden mood of gravity, heedless of his grinning and nudging companions.

Don Giuseppe stared at the boy with surprised attention, noting the wavy hair tossed back from a wide brow, and the fearless eyes that met his own.

"Can you remember the other sermon, too?" he asked.

"Not the whole of it, Father. Shall I say as much as I remember?"

The priest nodded, and the boy started off again, selecting from the second sermon precisely its most effective passages, which he repeated verbatim.

Then Don Giuseppe drew from the lad the simple facts of his family history.

"My father died when I was very small. There are five of us for my mother to look after. I have learned to read and write only a little."

"Have you studied Donat?" (The name of the Latin grammar then current.)

The boy shook his head with a wistful smile.

"I do not even know what that is."

"Would you like to study?"

"Oh, very, very much."

"Then why don't you?"

"Antonio won't let me. . . ."

"Who is Antonio, and what has he to say to it?"

"He is my big step-brother, and the head of the family. He says books are a waste of time and that I must do the work of the fields."

The priest resumed his homeward walk, but drawing the lad to his side, and motioning the others to go on.

"Tell me, now, why do you want so much to study?"

"Because I want to be a priest."

"And why do you want to be a priest?"

Young John looked up earnestly, and he gave his answer slowly.

"Because then I could teach and lead other boys, like my friends here. They are not wicked, but there is no one to tell them anything, and so they go to the bad!"

There was a long silence. At last the old priest broke it to ask: "Can you serve Mass?"

"Yes, Father."

"Good. Then come over to me to-morrow. I want to have a talk with you."

And it was this same old priest, poor, infirm and tired, who first hoisted the young barefoot lad on what proved to be such a long and difficult road to ordination.

Three books on Don Bosco,<sup>1</sup> issued within a few days of each other, and two of them from the same publisher, indicate the richness of this saint's story. There is little repetition in the three volumes, and all three are necessary for completeness of knowledge.

Mr. Jøergensen tells the whole story with his accustomed vividness of description and charm of manner. He has written a most readable book, thus fulfilling the first condition of a new volume's existence. Moreover, he has gathered his material with so loving an appreciation of his subject, that one has more than the usual hesitation in finding any quarrel with the result. But two characteristics which marred for me much of Mr. Jøergensen's previous writings, are present too in his *Don Bosco*: an emphasis on the personal note, peculiarly unwelcome in hagiography, and an irritating habit of digression.

When an author assures his readers that he has "put off from his feet the creaking shoes of the self-satisfied writer," one looks for the welcome relief, the quietude of academic detachment, yet such escape from the modern craze of egoism is not to be sought in this book. As for the digressions, look at the example on page fifty-two, and say whether this habit is pleasing.

The work on Saint John Bosco by Father H. L. Hughes is a welcome complement to Mr. Jøergensen's study, for Father Hughes deals mainly with the historical background, against which canvas Don Bosco's labours stand out with such striking effect. It is necessary to understand the anti-clericalism of the New Italy in which Don Bosco carved out his mission if the saint is to be seen in his true perspective. The author of *St. John Bosco* states in his Foreword: "Once the Saint is viewed in this historical setting it will, I think, be plain to all that, besides being one of the finest examples of nineteenth-century Italian Catholicity, he was in his day and generation one of the greatest benefactors of mankind."

The chapter on *The De-Christianization of Italy* is a penetrating analysis of the situation:

Pius XI in our own days has expressed himself as perfectly satisfied with a kingdom as small in size as the present Vatican City. Pius IX in 1871 was fundamentally of the same opinion. To Count d'Harcourt, the ambassador accredited to him by the French Republican Government of Thiers, he is said to have remarked: *Le plus petit pouce de territoire me suffirait.*

It was precisely this tiny corner of territory, however,

<sup>1</sup> (1) *Don Bosco*, by Johannes Jøergensen. Translated from the Danish by Ingeborg Lund. London: Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 1934. (2) *St. John Bosco* (1815-1888), by Rev. Henry Louis Hughes. Alexander Ouseley Limited, 1934. (3) *St. John Bosco's Early Apostolate*. (The Story of Don Bosco with his Boys.) A Translation from the work of G. Bonetti, S.C. London: Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 1934.

that the Radicals and anti-clericals sitting on the benches of the Left in the Italian parliament were determined never to grant the Pope. . . . Thus, thanks to the influence of the Radicals of the Left, the Roman Question remained an open and festering sore in Italian social and political life until the advent of Fascism in our own days drove the politicians of the Left from office. Their fall from power alone rendered possible the signing in 1929 of the Lateran Treaty between Pius XI and Mussolini.

Not only was St. John Bosco's vision almost supernaturally clear in the manner in which he viewed the Roman Question, but he had an equally correct appreciation of the needs of the Church in Italy. This was because, putting aside all wordly considerations, he looked at the problem from an entirely spiritual angle. . . .

Religious life in Italy was almost entirely at a standstill. The Religious Orders had most of them been suppressed, their property confiscated, many monasteries and convents turned into barracks and Government offices. In 1865, when the capital of Italy was transferred from Turin to Florence, twenty bishoprics in the former Kingdom of Piedmont alone were vacant. In the whole of Italy 108 episcopal sees were empty, and seventeen new bishops appointed by Pius IX had not been allowed by the Government to enter their dioceses.

Such was the paralyzing atmosphere against which Don Bosco prevailed. For his interesting book, so full of enlightenment, we thank Father Hughes.

The third book, which is a translation of Father Bonetti's classical work on *St. John Bosco's Early Apostolate*, deals with the first twenty-five years of the Saint's priesthood. It is a second edition of a book that has been acclaimed as a standard work since 1908. Little, therefore, remains for the present reviewer to add to the encomiums already gained by this volume. It is a large book, running into five hundred pages, and it describes the very heart of Don Bosco's effort—his work among his boys. The description is particularly valuable in that it is written by a Salesian priest, who was Don Bosco's disciple and devoted companion for thirty years. The Saint piped to a tune that all the youth of Italy could follow and, like a Pied Piper of the twentieth century, he led his dancing train from one inadequate place of refuge to another, ending finally in a meadow, when he could no longer find a roof. Growing numbers did not permit the first Salesian Oratory to preserve for very long this charming pastoral character. But the whole account of Don Bosco's traffic with unruly and unhappy boyhood is one of the most delightful with which Christian hagiography has provided us.



## HOMILETICS

BY THE REV. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J., M.A.

*Fifteenth Sunday after Pentecost (September 2nd).*

### *The Duel of Life and Death.*

Catholic sentiment has consecrated May to Our Lady. But September and October too are suffused with a kind of Marian glory—more deep and tender, more autumnal as it were, than the fresh morning light of May—due to her many feasts then kept, and to the Rosary. We shall not seem, then, to use far-fetched thoughts if we link these Sunday gospels with the devotion to Our Lady.

I. The position of Nain seems certain. It was to the South-East of Nazareth, a small town, with one gate, whence the road led downhill. The tumultuous Oriental crowd accompanied the open litter on which the dead boy lay, covered with a cloth. The whole motive of the miracle, at least immediately, was Our Lord's sympathy with the widowed mother who had lost her only son. It was for *her* that He had "compassion." (The word *ἐλεησίν* is surely not a "faded" one: it denotes strong emotion: His very heart was as it were twisted with pain, because of her pain.) Our Lord touched the litter and, by a single command, raised the lad to life. Recall, maybe, the strange efforts made by Elias and by Eliseus (III Kings xvii. 21; iv. 34), when they restored the widows' sons to life. And observe that it is here that for the first time St. Luke calls Our Lord (verse 13) simply *The Lord*. Awed by what he is about to relate, he realizes that indeed He is Lord of life and death and of all created things.

II. At the head of human Motherhood, is Eve—"mother of all the living" (Genesis iii. 20). But through Adam, Death had entered the world: "in Adam, all died." She became Mother, too, of all who should die. And when—the first Mater Dolorosa—she held the dead body of her son Abel in her arms, she too was as desolate as if he had been her only son, for Cain fled, and that was almost worse than if he had died, for, he was alive, but she could not see him. She did not know where he was save that he was "wandering" in double exile—outside of Eden, and away from her. Still, she was to bear other sons, though she did not know that then: her exclamation, when Seth was born: "God hath given, or *assigned*, me another seed instead of Abel!" was surely a cry of ecstatic joy, and because of that she gave to the child the assonant name of Seth (*assigned*: Sath). This ancient tradition, then, contains the whole mysterious doctrine about Eve—Mother of all the living:

mother of all who die, mother of life renewed. And the whole of the doctrine about Mary is, in reality, enshrined in the statement that she is the second Eve. So, St. Irenaeus.

It was not Eve who was responsible for our supernatural death, but Adam. And it was not Mary who redeemed and saved us and restored Grace to us, but Our Lord. Yet without Eve, the human race would not have come into existence; and, by the divine decree concerning the Incarnation, the Second Adam, Christ, the Head of the New Race of men, would not have come into existence without Mary. The Church is even now studying the doctrine of her "motherhood of all graces," and we are right in using of her such titles as "Co-redemptrix," dangerously misleading though they be to non-Catholic ears and minds. Mary, however, is irrevocably associated with Jesus, first, as His Mother, then, on Calvary, and again with the Apostles in the upper room at Pentecost. As Christ was the Second Adam, and yet because of His divine nature wholly transcended him, so, in a true sense, Mary is the Second Eve, yet because of her essential association with the life of God Incarnate, she too outpasses Eve and is unique in the world's history. There never was, nor will, nor can be, a second Mary.

III. God had compassion upon Eve. In the hour of her awful humiliation and punishment, He consoled her by the promise of the distant Messiah, her offspring; and He gave her another son after the death of her first-born. And Our Lord, on His Cross, had compassion on His Mother, and gave her John as "another son," to tend her. But heaven forbid that we should exclude from Our Lord's mind *anything* that mere words or actions, even miraculous, portend. All His miracles were "signs" and pointed beyond themselves. His resuscitations always indicated His will to give us "life, and life more abundant" (St. John x. 10). He did not stop at adding a few more years to the earthly life of that young man, dead now, after all, whole centuries ago. The history of Lazarus shows us how He envisaged His own miracles of life-renewal. And on the Cross, He knew all that Mary's motherhood ought to mean, and must mean, to us. We must then study it, and use it—simply and lovingly, of course; but also with profound understanding of her God-given rôle, and never separating it from that doctrine of Life, the supernatural life of Grace, to give which to ourselves her Son was born. Mother of Jesus, she is and must be Mother of us all who, by Grace, are made "one thing" with Him.

*Sixteenth Sunday after Pentecost (September 9th).*

*The Lowly Lifted High. St. Luke xiv. 1-11.*

Our Lord was at dinner with an important Pharisee upon a Sabbath. A sick man came and stood before Him. They were already "watching" Him, in case He might do something forbidden on that day. He said: "Is one allowed to heal on

the Sabbath, or not?" They preferred to make no answer. He took the man by the hand, healed him, and sent him off. Then He said: "Which of you, if his son or (even) his ox fell into a pit on the Sabbath, would not *at once* pull him out?" They had nothing to reply. Indeed, the contrast was violent. Such a "pit" would have been one of those cisterns at which cattle were watered. The parapet was low, or altogether lacking. In the shove of the butting oxen, beast or man could easily fall over, and risk floundering in the mud or even being trampled on. In such circumstances, Sabbath-rules were "immediately" disregarded. And here was a man, terribly sick, who, without any such hubbub, could be healed. Was there room for argument? The silence of the self-important Pharisees and religious lawyers implied that there was not. This was, one must confess, a certain snub, or humiliation, inflicted upon them. But Our Lord proceeded.

Don't snatch at the First Places. Possibly someone more important than you may come in, and then you will be asked to "go down one." Go and sit just anywhere: then perhaps the master of ceremonies—the expert in precedence—will tell you to "come up higher." Precedence was, and is, both in "ecclesiastical" and in "secular" functions, genuinely important. It corresponds to a social *fact*—Hierarchy. Hierarchy is right, and in the very nature of things, and no one should wish to wash it out. It is even right, at times, to *insist* on a "higher place," if the dignity of some office, that a man may hold, exacts it. But a very high virtue is demanded of one who should be able wholly to separate himself, and his liking for notice and flattery, from the office to which alone he demands that honour should be given. There is even an inverted snobbishness, which consists in taking the lower place, effacing oneself, in the hopes that one will be observed, singled out, and called on to the platform. We need not linger over those who allegedly "serve" on committees, boards, etc., and are huffed, sulk, take reprisals or resign if they do not get the proper meed of mention, votes of thanks, and so on. They receive them, looking like a veritable incarnation of "non nobis": but if they don't get them, they give a very pretty exhibition of sheer ego.

II. When Our Lady received the visit of the Angel, she drew back. It is clear that she expected the Messiah to be born of human parentage, and she had taken that vow of virginity that excluded her from any hope of becoming His mother. Of her birth, which we commemorated yesterday, and her childhood, we know nothing. From the outset, she had accustomed herself to "the lower place," in fact to sheer invisibility. If the tradition be true, that she was dedicated in the Temple, and spent her girlhood there, she was certainly unknown, unseen enough. How she became espoused to St. Joseph, we cannot tell; but at Nazareth, as his childless wife, she would have been known only as one whom God had *not*

blessed. If anything, she would have been a subject of criticism, like Anna. Read, to contrast it with the Magnificat, Anna's hymn of gratitude when she became mother of Samuel! It is the exultant, almost recriminatory, pæan of one who has seen her critics put to shame. She is now as good as they! Impossible to find any such thing in the words, or mind, of the humble Mother of the Lord. Exactly in the proportion that Our Lady understood her prerogative, she understood also what we said about "hierarchy." She was able to foresee that "all generations" would call her blessed. Yet we see no trace of her having claimed what was hers by right—save indeed the right to stand beside the Cross. "Let this mind be in you," says St. Paul (Phil. ii. 5-11), "which was also in Christ Jesus." He proceeds to recall that though He was by nature and in origin *God*, He did not consider the being treated as *God* a thing to be snatched at or held on to at all costs, but "emptied Himself," taking the nature of a servant, and being to the outward eye just what *man* is. And He humbled Himself (yet further), subordinating Himself right up to death—"yes, a death on a Cross!" *That* is why God hath utterly exalted Him, and given Him a Name to which every knee must kneel, and the rest. Jesus and Mary are then together in this—they *are*, yet they do not wish to *seem*, nor do they *claim*. Their associated exaltation has been, what is best, our spontaneous recognition of *reality*.

III. There is no real contradiction between this encouragement to self-effacement, and the encouragement that we give to men to "be ambitious" and to take up public posts, etc. We are often bewildered by the reluctance of Catholics to take on responsibilities, or even to be interested in what concerns local or national welfare. Leaving to one side the possibility that we think such occupations are "materialist" compared with directly Catholic work, and, indeed, that we fear that prominent men may "get out of hand" and interfere with ecclesiastical rights or disregard them, it is certain that a man is safe in proportion as he regards his public position as but a new opportunity for service, for putting "self" out of sight, whether financially, or in the matter of time and energy; and accepting his vocation, as Mary did, in terms of "servanthood"—*Ancilla Domini*. We could, thank God, quote eminent Catholics whose daily service is as laborious as it is obscure and unremunerative.

*Seventeenth Sunday after Pentecost (September 16th).*

*"What think you of Christ? Whose Son is He?"*

St. Matthew xxii. 34-36.

I. The whole of this episode has to be compared with Mark xii. 28-31, and indeed with Luke, x. 25-29, who puts the topic in quite a different context. It is clear that the Pharisees were

pleased that Our Lord had "muzzled" the Saducees, and were hoping to get Our Lord, after all, "on their side." They were "examining" Him, rather than trying to trap Him. We have to remember that Our Lord's fierce condemnations affected only one sort of Pharisee. Another, rarer, sort was—we may almost say—the backbone of true religion in Israel.

The Pharisees ask Our Lord which is the "great" commandment in the Law? (Possibly already Jewish casuists were distinguishing between "great" and "little" commandments.) Our Lord (perhaps startlingly changing "worship" into "love") answers that the great and first commandment is that you should love God with all your heart. The second, He adds, is "like" the first—on the same footing with it, because essentially flowing from it—that you must love your fellow-men as you love yourself. Our chief claim to love is, that God loves us. My loveliness is, what He sees to be lovable in me. But, He "similarly" loves my fellow-men. Therefore, I cannot *dare* not love them. I cannot hate, dislike, disregard, what God loves. The Pharisees crowded ever thicker round Him. He now asks *them* a question. "Who, in your view, is Christ?" That is, Whose son is He to be? "David's." "But, then, if David names Him 'Lord,' how can He *merely* be *his* son?" They were left without adequate reply.

II. We know that Jesus is Son of God, and Son of Mary. In this particular sermon, it is natural that we should fasten on the latter truth, and that we should not forget that yesterday the feast of Our Lady's Sorrows was observed. And, indeed, in so far as Our Lord was "son of David," He was so, because He was born of a human mother—was, in fact, Son of Mary. From the cross, we must repeat, Our Lord confided His Mother to St. John, saying: "Behold thy Mother." Many applications have been made of these words, which are apt, if but the principle underlying them be remembered. From the mere event, and the mere words, could we deduce more than that Our Lord wished to ensure that His Mother should be safe and tended after His departure? But when we recall that Mary is the Second Eve, and why, the sublimest consequences are derivable from the words; and if we can see them, so certainly could Our Lord. Owing to our incorporation with Him by grace, we are "one thing" with Him: we are His Body. Christians are unintelligible apart from Christ; but, in the divine dispensation, so is Christ without Christians. If the body needs a head, so does our Head exact a Body. Now to Christ's body—to Christ Himself—it was Mary who gave birth. If then we are mystically identified with Him, it was to us that she mystically gave birth. Being His Mother, she cannot but be ours. And since it was on the Cross that Our Lord's saving work was consummated, it was then that Mary became truly Mother of us, who from that time on became capable of incorporation with her Son. Hence, far from there being any sentimental exaggeration in the implications that we perceive in Our Lord's



words spoken from the cross, those implications are a dogmatic necessity.

III. But just as we were redeemed by Our Lord's Passion and Death, so our filiation as Mary's sons was consummated upon Calvary. Hence we are the sons of her sorrow. Her child-bearing too was one of pain. But while Eve had nothing but sorrow to get from the words of God to her (for, after all, the distant prophecy would have brought little comfort to her in comparison with the initial misery of her exile and the fore-casting of her fate—let alone her appreciation of the immediate anguish when the dead body of Abel was laid upon her knees), Mary was able "for the joy set before her" to share with her Son in enduring the cross and its shame. Only, we have to make sure that our sonship is one of joy for her. We ask her, in the Ave Maris Stella, to prove herself a mother; there is at least a corresponding responsibility upon us to show ourselves, so far as we can, not too unworthy sons. Only recently, we knew of a young man who had given his mother little but grief. Still, a few days before his death, he came back to God and to her. She had fulfilled both parts of the prophecy given to Eve. She had had the sorrow, in all conscience; but she had seen the victory of God, and the crushing of the serpent's head. Thus, her letters (from the other side of the world), though telling how in him she had "lost" everything she ever had had, were radiant. I dare to say that no letter of hers had been so happy as these last ones. Such is Christian love on the mother's side. But on the side of us, Mary's children, we cannot tolerate that we should just presume upon her love for us. We have to try to give Our Mother consolation and companionship. Dis-corporate from Jesus, by sin, we renew the sorrows of Mary, and create for her a loneliness, a childlessness, that were never meant to be hers.

*Eighteenth Sunday after Pentecost (September 23rd).*

*"The Remission of Sins."* St. Matthew ix. 1-8.

I. The story of the healing of the paralytic man is related by St. Matthew with extreme brevity (cf. Mark ii. 1-12; Luke v. 17-26). Nothing about the hole made in the roof, through which the mattress could be let down because the crowds prevented its being brought in through the door. You might imagine that St. Matthew did not know the circumstances—did not so much as know there *was* a crowd. But no! At the very end, the "crowds" appear, unheralded. "The crowd was astounded" at such power being given to men. So there were "crowds" there after all. The gospels are full of similar unintended items of evidence for their veracity, the more precious because they are adduced casually and indeed unnoticed by the evangelist, who knows all the details, but omits them so as to concentrate on what is, for him, the whole point of the narrative—here, Our Lord's power to forgive sins.



II. To be true to the connecting link of thought between these sermons, we must mention Our Lady. Nor have we any difficulty. To-morrow is kept the feast of Our Lady of Mercy, or rather, of Ransom. Centuries ago, Our Lady inspired several Saints to go to the rescue of Christians enslaved by the Saracens or Moors who had kidnapped them. A whole religious Order was founded for this purpose. It was, you may say, the heroic edition of the "Prisoners' Aid Society" proper to those times. And precisely because it was heroic, I suppose, it obtained far more help than our modern work-a-day Society does. It is appalling that that Society should languish. Our Lord mentions prisoners as one of those groups in which He could be visited. If men visited Him there, they were blessed. If they did not, they were bidden to depart from Him. Happy the official prison-chaplain! He knows that he is doing a work that *cannot* be mistaken, wrong or wasted. If the visit to prisoner X seems wasted, the visit to Prisoner Christ never can be wasted. But if I cannot co-operate by visiting prisons in any capacity (terribly important for the psychology of prisoners—especially first cases—as such contacts with decency, sympathy and ideas are), I might examine the whole situation of men and women just out of gaol, as to domicile and job. Unemployment almost ensures a new crime and conviction; and it is tragic if Catholics have to seek shelter anywhere save in a Catholic institution. Allied with this is the work of probationers, and police-courts. It cannot be denied that Catholics are far behind others, Jews included, in the development of this part of such work.

But Our Lady is more anxious still for the deliverance of such souls as are bound in the chains of sin. No chain is worse than a habit of sin. A habit gets possession both of imagination and of will. Left to myself, what have I got to conquer anything with, save my will? And if it is, precisely, my will that is weakened, I am defenceless. And if my imagination be habituated to wrong images, my will has too much work to do even as a normal faculty. For it is *abnormally* hard to get the better of a *normally* hostile imagination. Hence outside rescue is the more imperative: if we never can succeed without grace, still less can we do so in such cases.

III. We may not forget that during the past week the Ember Days have been kept. Have the Faithful fasted duly? Perhaps. Have they prayed, for the priests so soon to be created? We dare not suppose that it is their habit to do so. Ember Days risk being rather technical.

It is, however, good that future, and actual, priests be prayed for. The holier they are, the more they feel the need of prayer-help. Who can possibly feel that more acutely than the Pope, burdened with the *immenso pondere claves*, as Leo XIII called them? But the simplest priest has the right and duty to bind and loose. Those keys are, in their measure, in the hands of each of us. Perhaps even offering Mass—which we had practised

so often and which could hardly go wrong—did not impress a young priest so much, with fear and joy, as the consciousness that he could now absolve! The mortal sin is confessed—and forthwith *I* can extricate the bramble-strangled sheep; find the lost coin; welcome the long-lost son! Terrible responsibility of the Confessional, where, by complaisance, *I* can suggest to a soul that sin does not matter, or, by harshness, casualness, lack of tenderness, *I* can rebuff a soul—break the bruised reed, quench the still-smouldering wick! Many a protracted absence from the Sacraments can we trace to an original hardness in the Confessional. May Mary rescue me from my temperamental bias; from my moods; from my ignorance. May she make me into the true Rescuer, privileged not only to wash away old wounds, but so to invigorate the ransomed that he need never again succumb to the snares of his enemy! And may all the people pray for this. May they, in heart and if possible with lips, answer “*et cum spiritu tuo*” to the Priest who prays for them the Presence of the Lord.

*Nineteenth Sunday after Pentecost (September 30th).*

*The Marriage of the Lamb. St. Matthew xxii. 1-14.*

I. It is unnecessary to enter into the difficulties presented by this mysterious allegory, which exhibits the original mission of the prophets, then the earlier mission of the Apostles, and finally their mission to the Gentiles by means of whom the marriage-feast was ultimately filled. Fixing one's eye on the story, the details are not too appropriate. Guests, even when they refuse to come, do not kill the messengers; nor do they all live in one town; nor is a flouted host so angry that he sends and burns it down. Nor can a feast be ready, if the guests have then to be fetched from a considerable distance; nor, when they do not arrive, can it be kept waiting indefinitely. But if one fixes one's eye on the reality which the story describes, there is no such difficulty. The prophets were not listened to; the apostles were maltreated; Jerusalem was destroyed; and meantime the Gentiles had been coming in, at the further summons of the apostolic missionaries. As for the “marriage garment,” again, fixing one's eye on the story as such, it seems strange the men collected in the by-ways of the town, the riff-raff, should have possessed such things. If we insist, it must be assumed they had time to go home and clean up at least to some extent. But anyhow, with the change of scene, and the actual arrival of the king at the banquet, we must, I think, assume also a deepening of perspective. The feast has begun without the actual presence of the king in the banqueting-room; this is the duration of the Church's history: when He comes at the Last Day, His guests *must* be fit for Him: at such an hour, the cockle and the wheat shall indeed be separated; the ill-conditioned guest, cast forth. It may well be inappropriate to discuss such details (and others that we have not touched

on, especially the relation of St. Matthew's parable with Luke xiv. 15-24) in a sermon to a general audience: still, if they listen at all to the reading of the gospel, they hatch these difficulties for themselves not seldom, as experience shows; and they deserve an explanation; and the Scripture itself deserves that it should not leave an impression of mere queeriness.

II. In the Old Testament, the Day of the Lord had often been represented as a Feast, and the Messiah (and, indeed, God Himself) as the bridegroom of souls and of Israel. In the very last book of the Apocalypse, the metaphor returns constantly. Now it was due to Mary that the Eternal Word was enabled to assume our human nature, nor is it fanciful to meditate on Mary's presence at the marriage-feast of Cana, and certainly not, to see her in that "great symbol in the sky," the Woman bearing the Man Child and flying into the wilderness during the onslaught of the Dragon. The overwhelming majority of early commentators see in this symbol the Church—that Church which was Synagogue and Christian Church in vital continuity, each giving birth in its own way to Christ—Christ, the Messiah, and Christ endlessly reborn in the baptized. But just as the tremendous Day of the Lord was, as it were, made concrete in an event, like a siege of Jerusalem, so this mystical motherhood and mystical birth must be contemplated as localized, so to say, in the Birth of Our Lord from Mary. And the early persecution of the Church in Palestine, directly contemplated by St. John, must be spread out until it covers the whole history of the Church. We have, then, in the Apocalypse, the superb picture of Michael at war with the Dragon and conquering him. The Bride and the World-Wanton; the Lamb and the Wild Beast; Sion and Babylon—these are pairs of symbols that St. John uses so magnificently in this book; and, since he would not set God Himself, unique within the mysterious enclosure of the unrippling crystal sea, at war with created Evil even devilish, he conceives the picture of the glorious archangel whose feast we kept yesterday, swooping through the sky against the Dragon with his scarlet lashing tail, and ever anew inaugurating the contest that shall endure so long as the world does.

III. We are so much the victim of our senses that we are apt to neglect the fact that spirits, good and evil, innumerable more numerous than we are, immeasurably more powerful, throng God's world, and are concerned with *us*. Our wrestling, says St. Paul, is not against flesh and blood, but against the Rulers, the Powers, the World-Masters of this darkness, against the spiritual forces of evil in the air. (Eph. vi. 12). We say: "in the air," to translate St. Paul's "in the heavenlies," not only because that word is perfectly unintelligible, but because in Eph. ii. 2 he speaks of the devil as the Ruler of the power (or realm) of the air. Not yet possessed of a philosophical terminology, he conceives of ourselves upon the earth; God in His purely spiritual heaven, and created spirits somehow betwixt and between, "in the air," "air," not "aether"—indeed, the

realm of mist and fog and confusion. It is in that intermediate space that the conflict of Michael and the Dragon occurs. Each of us, then, with his puny intelligence and weakened will, puts up such fights as he may, wearing the "panoply" of faith: but each is the centre of a terrific combat: "forces" are at work, for and against us. Would that we could realize the terrific tension of this true tug-of-war! No wonder we sway to and fro, as we cling desperately to the strong arm of our guardian angel. For at times we relax our grip. We act as though nothing were happening. We account for the struggle in our life by material influences only—our environment; our physique; our temperament; our education. For all these are "material" in comparison with the "battle in the sky," waged ceaselessly on our account. May we make the very most, at anyrate, of the last prayer after Mass, invoking St. Michael, and alluding to those wicked spirits who haunt the world, and have no other aim than the "ruin of souls." And may we invoke whole-heartedly our *Regina Angelorum*, that she too may "give her angels charge over us," and bid them continue their fight, even though we should play craven in our own.

## NOTES ON RECENT WORK

### I. MORAL THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.

Although this column is principally concerned with the actualities of the moment, which are often highly controversial, some space must be given occasionally to the historical side of our subject—a serener and calmer atmosphere. There has appeared an amazingly thorough critical edition of some of the works of Francisco de Vitoria, a Dominican theologian who is regarded as the father of the great theological schools at Salamanca.<sup>1</sup> The interesting thing about him is that, while being the teacher of such men as Dominic de Soto, Melchior Cano, Bartholomew de Medina and Martin de Ledesma, whose works have been reprinted time and again, he himself published very little during his life time. It has been left to the filial piety of students in the direct line of Vitoria's school and tradition to reprint a mass of material, partly from the manuscript notes taken by students at the time, partly from the few printed works which have survived. One cannot help wondering why it has appeared necessary to the editor to publish an exact photographic reproduction of these notes and early printed editions, for both the manuscript and the reproduced facsimile of the printed text are difficult to read. But, certainly, the learned Society responsible for the edition is the best judge of what befits the works of an author so renowned, and this word of criticism, which is no doubt due to our own ignorance of the reasons, in no way lessens our gratitude for this valuable text. For Vitoria did more than any other theologian of that date to meet the intellectual needs of his age, at a time when scholasticism was in some disrepute and required adaptation to new conditions. He taught at Paris in 1516, at Valladolid in 1522 and at Salamanca from 1524-1544. Fr. Beltran de Heredia's list of Vitoria's lectures in manuscript is given on page ix. of this edition. The subjects are chiefly concerned with what we should, in these days, call Moral Theology, *e.g.*, De Homicidio, De Matrimonio, De Simonia, De Temperantia, De Jure Belli, De Magia. The trouble seems to be that to which every professor is liable: the students' notes give different versions of what Vitoria is alleged to have said in his lectures; hence the necessity of critically choosing more than one representative text for

<sup>1</sup> *Relecciones Teologicas del Maestro Fray Francisco de Vitoria*. Edicion critica, con facsimil de codices y ediciones principes, variantes, version castellana, notas e introduccion. Par el P. Mtro. Fr. Luis G Alonso Getino Cronista de Salamanca y Bibliotecario de la "Asociacion Francisco de Vitoria." Madrid, 1933. Vol. I, xlviii+490 pages.

reproduction in this volume. This publication is a valuable piece of work both for its own sake, and as demonstrating a truth which may often be overlooked. The brilliant names of Vitoria's students have, no doubt, superseded that of the master, as their finished works are certainly superior. But, it is to him that is due the planting of the seed which flowered so splendidly, and the inspiration which was caught up by younger minds and utilized for the glory of theological science.

We may, perhaps, be permitted to mention in this REVIEW a somewhat analogous example of more recent date. On June 21st last Dr. Alfred Herbert, M.A., died in a London nursing home at the age of eighty. Many generations of the clergy in the South of England received their training in humanities from him at Oscott and Old Hall—a grounding in humanities has always been reckoned by the Church an indispensable part of the training of a priest. The niceties of theological speculation were probably rather remote from Dr. Herbert's interests, but the exactness of his learning, the thoroughness of his method, his legal mind, and his brilliant wit and enthusiasm have had a lasting effect on many generations of the clergy who were so fortunate as to come under his influence. R.I.P.

Some of the more considerable contributions to the study of Moral Theology are contained, not in printed books, but in Review articles, particularly in those cases where a friendly controversy, sustaining different points of view, has arisen. "De Consulendo Minus Malum" is a case in point. In *EPHEMERIDES LOVANIENSES*, 1931, p. 615, Fr. L. Bender, O.P., submitted this important subject to a careful examination, studying the theological teaching before St. Alphonsus and questioning the reliability of some manualists whose conclusions were based on the use of second-hand quotations. The occasion of this discussion was a statement of Dr. van de Velde that the use of contraceptives could be harmonized with the moral teaching of the Church, at least to this extent, that if people were determined to prevent conception they could be advised to adopt those methods which were accompanied by less physical harm. It is a point of view which is not uncommon in the non-Catholic medical profession, and, if it is to be accepted, would obviously be a grave menace, and would largely nullify the insistent directions of the Church on this unsavoury subject. No Catholic theologian, we believe, has ever applied the theory to this case, and Fr. Bender's critics do not, of course, apply it. His examination of the classical authors led him to the conclusion that there was no greater external probability for the opinion favouring the lawfulness of counselling a lesser evil than for the opinion which condemned it; and from an examination of the internal arguments the conclusion was reached that they lacked validity. In the same journal, 1933, p. 618, Fr. J. Cacciatore, C.S.S.R., contested some of the previous writer's statements as being too rigid: "*Absque difficultate eius (i.e., Laymann's) rationes solvuntur, dum ex alia parte auctoritas theologorum, ut*



S. Augustinus et D. Thomas, definitive nobis suadent probabilitatem sententiae quae licitatem profitetur consilii ad minus diversae speciei absque limitationibus . . . si inspiciamus valorem argumentorum utriusque sententiae, absque difficultate constabit affirmativam sententiam longe prae opposita probabiliorem esse." A further examination by Fr. Bender, O.P., stresses a distinction which, if born in mind, will make it possible to admit the liberal doctrine of certain authors, namely: it is unlawful to counsel an evil action, as such, but it may be lawful for a grave reason, and other things being equal, to recall to a person's memory that by choosing a lesser evil it will be sufficient for his purpose, and one may do this while foreseeing that such a course will be adopted. The distinction is a very fine one and lends itself to the usual reproaches of all the opponents of casuistry, but we are inclined to agree with Fr. Bender that to do anything more than merely "recall to memory" is to counsel something "formaliter malum," which is clearly forbidden. Probably the last word is not yet said on this subject, which is as elusive as it is practical. The matter discussed in these articles, as well as in *Periodica*, 1932, p. 57, is worth preserving in a more permanent form. One thing, at least, is quite certain. Our understanding of some of these finer points discussed by the theologians is vastly assisted by such controversies as this, which trace a doctrine back to its earliest sources and place the statements of the modern manualist in a truer perspective.

So many of these problems are solved correctly only on the assumption that the person giving his mind to the subject has reached the somewhat exacting standard which the theologians require in a "prudent" man. The virtue of Prudence, as St. Thomas expounds it, is that *recta ratio agibilium* which must govern all human action, particularly when it involves the risk of committing sin. This virtue finds its proper place in Fr. G. J. MacGillivray's book on *The Christian Virtues*.<sup>2</sup> It is a short compendium of Christian morality, following the principles of St. Thomas, and is an admirable introduction to the subject. The reader will almost certainly turn to the pages of the *Summa* in order to fill in the details. In his analysis of the movement of the rational creature towards God, in I-IIae and II-IIae, St. Thomas may rightly be said to have created Moral Theology as an ordered science: there is nothing quite corresponding to it in previous summaries of theology, as may be verified by comparing the structure of the *Summa* with the arrangement of the Sentences of Peter Lombard.

Dr. Raoul Guchteneere has republished his contributions to *La Cité Chrétienne* on the subject of the recent Sterilization Law in Germany, which he agrees has no political significance. But it is, at the same time, difficult for us entirely to dissociate this attack on the personal integrity of the subject from other manifestations of physical violence on the part of the Nazi régime.

<sup>2</sup> Burns Oates & Washbourne, pp. 176.

In the course of his exposition of the law, this writer, who is a recognized authority on medical ethics, records his view, which we think is the correct one, that it is permitted to regard sterilization as lawful, because a therapeutic measure, in certain cases of mental derangement and sexual perversion, when the operation is judged to be a means for modifying and correcting dangerous abnormal tendencies.

A further reprint from the same journal is the series of articles contributed by the editor, Abbé Jacques Leclercq, on the moral aspect of war and military service. It is a careful review of the difficulties inherent in the subject rather than a reasoned solution of the problem, and we are warned against adopting a simple, straightforward solution, whether it be the extreme position of the conscientious objector or the equally extreme militarist attitude: for modern warfare is definitely not a remedy ensuring the peace of the future, nor can it be avoided by a blind adherence to a policy of peace at any price. The only constructive means of avoiding war lies in strengthening some positive organization, which will assure and impose a peaceful decision whenever conflicts arise between nations.

The practice is growing, an excellent one in many respects, of devoting one number of a periodical entirely to one subject. For example, *Rivista del Clero Italiano* for July is entirely concerned with the many practical problems arising from the ecclesiastical law prohibiting certain activities on Sundays and Holydays. It is constructive in character and, happily, breaks away from the manualist treatment of the subject, by discussing, amongst other things, Sunday sport and Sunday Cinema. The latter is also a problem for every other day of the week, and the energetic action of the Catholic Episcopate in America, which appears to have boycotted successfully the indecent film, has received much publicity in this country. Further suggestions on the subject may be read in a brochure by Fr. L. de Coninck, S.J., reprinted from *Nouvelle Revue Catholique*;<sup>3</sup> it is shown to be a most fertile field for Catholic Action, not in the sense of producing Catholic films, which would be practically impossible from the financial point of view, but by educating the public conscience in the right direction.

The recommendations of a third interim report (Cmd. 4637), which has been presented to the Lord Chancellor by the *Law Revision Committee* at the beginning of July, brings the civil law into line, in many respects, with the teaching of Moral theologians regarding *restitutio in solidum*, in the case of an injury inflicted by many co-operators. "Co-operatores in eadem specie et gradu singuli tenentur ratam partem restituere et ceteri in defectu aliorum, nec ullus ordo necessario est servandus inter ipsos. Si aliqui totum restituerint, *recursum habent pro rata parte contra ceteros*."<sup>4</sup> As the English law stands at present,

<sup>3</sup> Casterman, Paris.

<sup>4</sup> Slater, *De Justitia et Jure*, n. 151.

when several persons join in committing a wrong, the plaintiff may make any one of them the defendant in an action and can recover the whole amount from any one. So far so good. Subject to certain modifications in intricate cases, this is the rule of natural justice and is reflected in Canon 2211: "Omnes qui in delictum concurrunt ad normam Can. 2209, §1-3, obligatione tenentur in solidum expensas et damna resarciendi quae ex delicto quibuslibet personis obvenerint, licet a iudice pro rata damnati." But, as indicated in the portion of Fr. Slater's words which we have italicized, the person who has made good the whole damage is entitled to a claim against his partners, that is to say, those partners are bound in conscience to contribute their share. But in English law, at present, this right is not respected owing to the rule that there is no contribution between joint tort-feasors. If judgment is enforced against a single selected wrongdoer he can obtain no contribution from his companions. The Committee proposes to abolish this rule which is of no great antiquity and subject to many exceptions. "Any person who is adjudged to be liable to make any payment or who suffers execution under a judgment recovered against him in respect of an actionable wrong may recover contribution, whether the wrong be a crime or not, from any other person who has been made liable in respect of the same wrong, or who, if sued separately, would have been so liable, unless the person against whom contribution is sought proves that he is by law entitled to be indemnified in respect of his liability by the person seeking contribution. It shall be for the Judge to decide what the amount of the contribution is to be, or whether complete indemnity is to be given."

A further change in English legal procedure, bringing it into line with canonical practice, is foreshadowed in Lord Merrivale's Bill, which has passed the House of Lords, providing for nullity cases to be heard in private.

We have had occasion to refer, in the past, to certain useful summaries of all the authoritative decisions of the Church which interpret the Code of Canon Law. The latest example of this kind of work is so good and complete that we have no hesitation in returning to the subject. The fact, of course, is that any living system of law is constantly undergoing development. New decisions and new interpretations have made it necessary to possess, in addition to the text of the Code and some classical commentary, the decisions of the Codex Commission, at least. But these decisions are only a fraction of all that is available from official sources; the matter upon which a decision is given has often been referred to some other Roman Congregation which enjoys equal authority. Then there are the instructions and decrees of these Congregations and, most useful of all, the judicial sentences given by a competent tribunal in contentious causes. It is evident that Fr. Bouscaren, S.J., the Professor of Canon Law at St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, Mundelein, has given considerable time and extreme care to his collection of every relevant document that has appeared since the Code was promul-

gated. In his *Canon Law Digest*<sup>5</sup> they are arranged in the order of the Canons of the Code. In most cases, the essential part of the document has been translated into English with no abridgement, together with a reference to its original source and, very often, a further reference to a commentary in one or other of the ecclesiastical reviews. Writing primarily for Americans these references take chiefly into account the journals of that country, but prominent European publications such as *Periodica* and *Jus Pontificium* are also referred to. Considerable use is made of *Sacrae Romanae Rotae Decisiones*, a source which we do not remember seeing much utilized in similar collections. The summary, especially, of the marriage causes which have come before the Rota, is most practical and useful: for example, under Canon 1087 we are given references, generally with some indication of the exact point at issue, to about thirty nullity causes *de vi et metu* which have been brought before the Rota. There is a chronological index to all this mass of documents, and an alphabetical index which follows closely the method of the Code Index itself. From one point of view, it is to be regretted that the documents are not in their original Latin, as the reader will sometimes not feel happy unless he has verified the accuracy of the version. But an English translation is an advantage to the large class of people interested in Canon Law who are not familiar with Latin, and the work does not suffer thereby as a reference book. All relevant documents up to the end of 1933 are included in this summary and the publishers propose to keep it up-to-date by issuing a supplement periodically.

The commentary on the Code, designed principally for Missionary countries, by Fr. G. Vromant of the Scheut Missionary Society is now complete with the remaining volume: *Introductio et Normae Generales*.<sup>6</sup> The first part of the Introduction deals with the notion of a missionary country and gives some account of the sources of the law which is special to such a district; this is followed by a dissertation on the right and duty of propagating the Faith. Those who are interested in the *Association for the Propagation of the Faith* will find some useful matter in the pages dealing with the duty of Bishops and diocesan clergy to support the foreign missions; the words of recent Pontiffs are summarized and special attention is given to the obligation of fostering missionary vocations.<sup>7</sup> The remaining portion of the book covers the ordinary ground of most of the commentaries on the First Book of the Code. An Appendix contains the *Formula Tertia* of the Faculties conceded by Propaganda to Ordinaries in Missionary parts. In *De Bonis Ecclesiae Temporalibus*, which is now in its second edition, the author gives a summary explanation of what constitutes the

<sup>5</sup> Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee.

<sup>6</sup> Musaeum Lessianum, Louvain, 241 pp. and 392 pp.

<sup>7</sup> This matter was the subject of the address given by His Grace the Archbishop of Liverpool at Freshfield on June 26th (*Tablet*, Vol. 164, 1934, p. 14).

fruits of a benefice, an important point in view of Canon 1473 which imposes the obligation of giving any superfluity, after the reasonable support of the beneficiary has been provided for, to pious and charitable purposes. Included in the *fructus beneficialis* are any pensions which may be paid by a civil government to missionaries, and any taxed contributions from the faithful, as well as the stipends of founded Masses which are united with the benefice. But other offerings of the faithful including stole fees, are probably not included, in Fr. Vromant's view. This solution, we think, hardly applies to places where the whole substance of the funds for the support of the priest is derived from the voluntary offerings of the faithful.

## II. HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY THE REV. JOHN M. T. BARTON, D.D., Lic.S.Script.

The professors of Holy Scripture at the Collegio Angelico in Rome, which, as is generally known, is the principal Dominican University in the Catholic world, are men greatly to be envied. They all three have very full programmes of lectures, they are constantly in request for advice or consultation, yet they manage to produce books that are considerable for both size and scholarship. The senior professor, Père Jacques M. Vosté, O.P., Consultor of the Biblical Commission and of the Congregation for the Eastern Church, is the author of standard works on the Parables, on selected topics from St. John and St. Paul, on Thessalonians and Ephesians, and on the Virgin Birth. Frequent reference has been made in these pages to his books which, in addition to their merits as works of erudition, are models of clear statement and graceful Latinity.<sup>1</sup> He has recently contributed a valuable series of articles to the University's periodical *Angelicum*,<sup>2</sup> treating of Our Lord's baptism.

My immediate business is, however, to review the latest works of the Angelico's other two Biblical experts. The smaller of the two books, though it is only relatively small, being a work of over four hundred pages, is a very thorough discussion of the first eleven chapters of Genesis, entitled *De Historia Primaeva*, the author of which is Père François Ceuppens, O.P.<sup>3</sup> Not all the matter in it is entirely new, since three of its component parts have already appeared in separate form, namely, *De Diluvio biblico* in 1930, *De Hexaemeron* in 1931 and *De Protoevangelio* in 1932.<sup>4</sup> A comparison of these fascicles with the present work shows that the type has been re-set and the format improved, and that a number of changes have been made in the lectures themselves, notably in regard of the

<sup>1</sup> See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. III, p. 148; Vol. VI, p. 145; Vol. VII, p. 151.

<sup>2</sup> Annus XI, fasc. 2 & 3.

<sup>3</sup> Romae, Collegio Angelico, Salita del Grillo, 1; pp. xii+408. Price L.40.

<sup>4</sup> See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. VI, pp. 146-7.



bibliographies. The tendency has been to reduce the amount of Hebrew type, and in this connection it could be wished that a more scientific form of transcription had been uniformly adopted.<sup>5</sup> This is a minor point. The important matter is that Père Ceuppens has given us a study of the first eleven chapters which is at once traditional, up to date and well documented. It should be obvious to everybody that these chapters are of exceptional importance and that a cursory or superficial treatment of them is often worse than no treatment at all. Here there is no attempt to hurry over difficult questions, and no pains have been spared to make the setting out of the problems as complete as possible. So, apropos of the creation narratives, there is first a careful study of the text and then, under the title "*Critica historica*," a three-fold enquiry dealing in turn (a) with the various systems of interpretation—Antiochene, Alexandrian, concordantist, idealistic, and so forth; (b) with the biblical cosmogony as compared with the cosmogonies of other nations—Egyptian, Babylonian and Phœnician; (c) with the doctrine enshrined in the narrative under the three headings: Monotheism, the doctrine concerning creation, the doctrine regarding man.

The author's conclusions about certain disputed matters may be of some interest. As regards the creation of man's body: "*Conclusio igitur nostra, quoad corporis primi hominis formationem, est quod non obstantibus omnibus istis declarationibus [in the Leroy, Zahm and Bonomelli cases], omnis evolutio non est rejicienda neque damnanda*" (p. 133). A little later: "*Haec doctrina de evolutionismo mitigato revera doctrinae christianae fundamentum attingit, illud tamen non destruit*" (p. 134). As regards the Flood, it is in Père Ceuppen's opinion, certain on scientific grounds that it was not geographically universal; as regards its ethnographical universality, there is more difficulty. "*Opinamur quaestionem nostris diebus definitive nondum solvi posse, illam uti liberam et adhuc apertam consideramus atque explicationem de universalitate relativa quoad homines probabiliorem judicamus*" (p. 374). Apropos of Woolley's discovery in 1929<sup>6</sup> of traces of a local Babylonian flood, the author rightly considers (against Woolley and Dhorme) that the discovery does not prove the identity of the Biblical and the Babylonian catastrophes, but only the *possibility* of their identity (pp. 375-6). Nowadays, as he says, Woolley's identification is rapidly losing its supporters. In the matter of the Tower of Babel, the author points out that, while Catholic

<sup>5</sup> E.g. p. 31 for *betzalmēnū* read *bečalmēnū*; p. 98 *siāch* read *si'h*; p. 99 *jachaleh* read *ya'aleh*. Admittedly there is no absolutely definitive system of transcription, but the principles should surely obtain (a) that that system should be adopted which makes it as simple as possible for a Semitist to put back the words into the original characters; (b) that, wherever it is feasible, one European character should stand for one Semitic character. So the ugly and meaningless *tz, ch*, and the rest would be banished.

<sup>6</sup> See *Ur of the Chaldees*, by C. Leonard Woolley; Benn, 1929, pp. 17-32.



authors defend the historicity of the narrative, they are very far from being united as regards its explanation (pp. 386-9).

The second of the two works that have recently been produced at the Angelico is P. Serafino Zarb's *De Historia Canonis Utriusque Testamenti*.<sup>7</sup> In this connection, it may be remembered that as recently as last November, there was a review in these columns of Père Lagrange's *Histoire Ancienne du Canon du Nouveau Testament*.<sup>8</sup> P. Zarb's book is, it should be said, more complete than Père Lagrange's, since it includes the Canons of both the Old and the New Testaments and has a really convincing air of finality about it. This can, of course, only be said with reference to the fundamental solutions. In matters of details there is still a vast amount of work to be done and, though P. Zarb's bibliography is marvellously comprehensive, it cannot, naturally, be expected to include all the latest documentation on the relations between the Epistle of Barnabas and the Didache.<sup>9</sup> But he has done a great deal more than provide an able treatise on the Canon. It is notorious that, whereas a course of lectures on the Canon must involve frequent reference to a great many ancient documents, the average student is rarely in a position to consult such documents. Even if he has access to a large and well-equipped library, he may find it difficult, by reason of his lack of practice in research, to lay his hand upon the exact book he requires. Certain textbooks (the exhaustive handbook of Cornely-Merk is one example of this) have attempted to supply some of these sources in an appendix, but no author, so far as I am aware, has been so generous to his readers as P. Zarb. The section entitled "*Usus librorum Novi Testamenti apud Patres*" runs to nearly a hundred pages and, in addition to such well-known sources as the Muratorian Fragment and the Monarchian Prologues, provides copious extracts from the patristic writings that will help the student more surely than would any summary. The book is perhaps a trifle too long to be appreciated in its entirety by a student who is working through the subject for the first time. But, with the help of a teacher, his attention may be concentrated upon the more vital sections and the book as a whole will remain an invaluable work of reference.

Books on Messianic prophecy are numerous, but it is rarely that one is edited in the sumptuous style of M. Jean-Joseph Brierre-Narbonne's folio volume on *Les Prophéties Messianiques de l'Ancien Testament dans la Littérature Juive en accord avec le Nouveau Testament*.<sup>10</sup> The author has an introduction on

<sup>7</sup> Romae apud Pont. Institutum Angelicum, editio secunda, 1934; xxxv + 567. Price L.35.

<sup>8</sup> Gabalda, Paris, 1933; pp. viii + 188. See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. VI, pp. 399-400.

<sup>9</sup> See *Journal of Theological Studies*, April, 1934, pp. 113-146.

<sup>10</sup> . . . avec une introduction sur la littérature messianique juive, apocryphe, targoumique, talmudique, midrachique, zoharique et rabbinique. Paris, Geuthner, 1933; pp. xvii + 106. Price 100 frs.

the Talmudic and other Jewish literatures and a fairly complete bibliography, which not seldom omits the place of publication and date of the volumes catalogued. The essential part of the work is a species of harmony in three columns which give respectively the Old Testament passage (in a French translation), the relevant New Testament extracts and the Rabbinical authors in their commentary or enlargement upon the passage. Where it has not been possible to include all the Jewish commentaries in the right-hand column, they are set at the foot of the page with short notes upon the likenesses and the divergences. The author has prepared himself for the task by many years of study, which included the reading in their entirety of all the Jewish works that he cites. He hopes to supplement the main work with a number of auxiliary studies dealing with the exegesis of the Messianic prophecies that is found in the Talmud, the Midrashic writings, the Targums, the apocryphal works and the Cabbala. The first of these has already appeared and is entitled *Exégèse Talmudique des Prophéties Messianiques*.<sup>11</sup> There is a long introduction on Talmudic Messianism and all the Talmudic extracts are given, first in the unpointed Hebrew text and then in translation with a few notes and cross-references. It would be difficult to praise too highly the patience and the erudition that have contributed to produce a harmony of this kind. For a commentator on the Messianic prophecies it will be of quite singular value. It is to be hoped that it may lead certain of its Jewish readers to appreciate the truth of St. Augustine's dictum "Et novum in vetere est figuratum et vetus in novo est revelatum."

Two more volumes of the excellent Bonn commentary have recently appeared. One is a new edition of Dr. Alphons Steinmann's *Die Apostelgeschichte übersetzt und erklärt*,<sup>12</sup> of which some eighteen thousand copies have so far been printed. Unfortunately the bibliography has not been very carefully revised. Camerlynck and Vander Heeren: *Commentarius in Actus Apostolorum* was re-issued in a seventh edition in 1923; Mr. A. C. Clark's *The Acts of the Apostles* (1933) and the final volumes of *The Beginnings of Christianity* should certainly have been mentioned. The slight bibliographical additions on p. 319 are wholly insufficient. The other volume, Professor Paul Heinisch's *Das Buch Exodus*,<sup>13</sup> is a new book and, as readers of his accomplished commentary on Genesis<sup>14</sup> would be led to expect, is a work of very finished scholarship. In its main lines the commentary is a straightforward explanation of the text, but it has one pleasing feature which would have gladdened the heart of that excellent lawyer and enthusiastic Pentateuchal critic, the late Mr. Harold Wiener. Wiener, who was employed

<sup>11</sup> Geuthner, Paris, 1934; pp. 120. Price 50 frs.

<sup>12</sup> Hanstein, Bonn, 1934; pp. xvi + 320; price unbound M.11.50; bound M.13.70.

<sup>13</sup> Hanstein, Bonn, 1934; pp. xv + 297. Price unbound M.10.80; bound M.12.80.

<sup>14</sup> See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. I, p. 532.

in conveyancing, that most precise art, was persuaded that many of the critics' blunders in dealing with the Mosaic legislation were due to their ignorance of even very rudimentary legal principles. He constantly appealed to them to remedy this defect, but without any marked success. At length after fifteen years of effort, he persuaded Professor Böhl of Groningen (now of Leyden) that "the conduct of the critics was as ridiculous as would be the act of a man who knew no Hebrew, could not distinguish between a *dáleth* and a *rêsh*, and put forward a new theory of the Hebrew language on the basis of his ignorance. This had the desired effect."<sup>15</sup> Dr. Heinisch has evidently been at pains to guard against such mistakes in commenting upon a book so full of legislation as Exodus. Writing as he does from Nymwegen in Holland, he acknowledges help received from the University professor of legal history and civil law, Dr. E. van der Heijden, who was "so liebenswürdig mir bei der Erklärung des Bundesbuches juristische Winke zu geben." There can be little doubt that the second "Anhang" entitled "Gesamtbetrachtung zum Bundesbuch" (pp. 272-90) owes something to Professor van der Heijden's jurisprudential ability.

The first book of the Westminster Version of the Old Testament is edited by Fr. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., *The Book of Malachy*.<sup>16</sup> It is explained in the preface that the New Testament in the Version is now almost complete (only Mgr. Dean's *St. Luke* remains to be published) and that the much-desired abridged edition is also in preparation. The Old Testament "promises to be a slower and heavier task, not merely because of the quality and quantity of the work involved, but chiefly by reason of the cost of production." It is suggested that the financing of individual books in part or whole might be undertaken, a benefaction that would be duly recognized in the books thus issued. It is good to realize that a definite start has been made with the Old Testament translation and it was a happy inspiration to place the new undertaking under the patronage of the great Prophet of the Mass (as Malachy is rightly styled by Catholic interpretation). Among books in immediate preparation are Ruth, the Psalms, Amos and Habakkuk. Fr. Lattey, in his introduction, naturally devotes a great deal of the space to the Eucharistic prophecy, its fulfilment and its recognition in Scripture and tradition. A concluding section meets some difficulties that have been raised against the Eucharistic interpretation. The translation is arranged to bring out in English the metrical arrangement in Kittel's edition of the Hebrew text. The commentary is very complete and the printing of the book wholly delightful.

<sup>15</sup> See his *Posthumous Essays*, edited by Mr. Herbert Loewe, Oxford, 1932, pp. 83-84. They were noticed in the CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. V, p. 158.

<sup>16</sup> Longmans, 1934; pp. xxxii+21. Price 1s. 9d. (paper covers) and 2s. 3d. net (cloth boards).

It is hardly necessary to do more than call attention to the fact that the selection of passages for *The Bible for Every Day* has been made by His Grace Archbishop Goodier.<sup>17</sup> This in itself should ensure it a record sale. It may be added that, in the case of the New Testament, which supplies just under a hundred of the three hundred and sixty-five extracts, the rendering of the Westminster Version has been followed. In the Old Testament, occasional slight changes have been made in the Douay text and (a very distinct gain) the poetry is printed as poetry, as in the highly successful work of a Protestant writer, Dr. R. G. Moulton's *Modern Reader's Bible*. In selections of this kind, it is impossible to please quite everybody, for we all have our favourite passages and are disappointed if we fail to discover them. At least it must be said that the Archbishop has chosen his extracts with great care and discrimination, and that not many, if any, of the famous passages can have escaped his vigilant eye.

Lastly, I come to a book which, if it is not strictly Scripture, is the biography of an eminent scripturist, the author of the best known of all the concordances. It is *The Eccentric Life of Alexander Cruden* by Edith Olivier,<sup>18</sup> and it would be difficult to find a more amusing and entertaining book. Cruden was one of those people whose external lives have little or no connection with their scholarship. So, when he was not making innumerable list of words for the concordance, he was intervening in street-brawls, rescuing criminals from the gallows, or (not infrequently) passing his time in lunatic asylums, from one of which he escaped with the leg of the bed chained to his own! In spite of the temptation that may have assailed her to concentrate upon her subject's rebuffs and misfortunes (and they were many) the author tells us quite a number of things about the Complete Concordance. For one thing it was not quite complete. Huz the brother of Buz (Genesis xxii. 21) was left out; so were the "powders" of the perfumer in Cant. iii. 6. Perhaps the best chapter on Cruden's scholarship is No. V, which gives selections from his "Significations." These are full of weird natural history and make excellent reading.

<sup>17</sup> Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1934, pp. 286. Price 5s.

<sup>18</sup> Faber & Faber, pp. 240. Price 12s. 6d.

## MORAL CASES

### DISPARITAS CULTUS.

From Canons 1043 and 1044 ample powers are given to priests for dispensing from matrimonial impediments *in periculo mortis*. In the case of "mixed religion" and "difference of worship" the law requires the usual guarantees to be given before a dispensation is granted. What is to be done if the non-Catholic party refuses to give these guarantees? A *sanatio in radice* could be obtained in ordinary circumstances but the use of the powers conceded by Canons 1043 and 1044 supposes that there is no time to have recourse to the Ordinary. May the priest validly and lawfully dispense without obtaining the guarantees?

(V.)

#### REPLY.

To appreciate the detail raised in this query it is necessary to examine the background on which it is placed. From Canons 1043 and 1044 Ordinaries may grant dispensations both from the form of marriage (priest and two witnesses), and from any ecclesiastical impediment, whether public or occult, except the priesthood and affinity in the direct line arising from a consummated marriage; when a dispensation is granted from "disparity of worship" or "mixed religion" the usual guarantees must be exacted. If the Ordinary cannot be reached, this dispensing power may be used by any priest who is competent to witness marriages and also, but only for the internal sacramental forum, by a confessor. In order to eliminate difficulties which do not directly bear on the terms of the question, we will suppose that the priest in the case is competent for marriages, i.e., he is the parish priest or possesses delegated powers. The situation is that he enjoys *ad hoc* exactly the same powers as the Ordinary in granting dispensations, and the limits of his jurisdiction will, therefore, be ascertained by discovering what are the limits of the Ordinary's jurisdiction.

It is hardly necessary to remark that the *proviso* about guarantees finds a place in this Canon because the powers conceded are restricted to purely ecclesiastical impediments, whereas the impediments of "difference of worship" and "mixed religion," unless the danger of perversion is removed, are really not merely ecclesiastical but divine law.<sup>1</sup> *Jure divino* no dispensation may be granted unless the danger of perversion is made remote; *jure ecclesiastico* no dispensation may be granted unless the guarantees of Canon 1061 are given. "Igitur dispensatio semper et necessario supponit atque exigit ut praevisi sublati fuerit prohibitio juris divini, quatenus proximum per-

<sup>1</sup> Canon 1060.



versionis periculum partis catholicae cessaverit simulque cautum sit catholicae educationi universae sobolis. Praedictae conditiones jure ipso divino requisitae *in tuto* poni debent. Id autem fit per *cautiones*, quas vocant, legitima forma praestandas, ut inde moralis certitudo habeatur conditiones essentielles ad executionem demandantium iri. Nonnulli confundunt seu promiscue usurpant *conditiones* et *cautiones*. Sed, proprie et accurate loquendo, istae ab illis probe distinguuntur. Nam *conditiones* sunt *juris divini*, dum e contra *cautiones* sunt *juris ecclesiasticae*, et dici possunt media sive assecurationes, quibus *in tuto* ponitur earundem conditionum implementum."<sup>2</sup>

A recent decree of the Holy Office, January 13th, 1932, seems to leave no loophole whatever: "E.mi ac Rev.mi D.ni Cardinales . . . strictu sui muneris esse duxerunt, omnium Sacrorum Antistitum necnon parochorum aliorumque, de quibus in canone 1044, qui super mixtae religionis ac disparis cultus impedimenti facultate aucti sunt, attentionem excitare et conscientiam convenire, ne dispensationes huiusmodi unquam impertiantur, nisi praestitis antea a nupturientibus cautionibus . . . secus ipsa dispensatio sit prorsus nulla et invalida." In commenting on this decree Fr. Cappello (*loc. cit.*) underlines its conclusions: "Dispensatio concessa, sine cautionibus antea praestitis a nupturientibus 'prorsus nulla et invalida declaratur.' Ex dictis id valet de dispensatione quovis in casu et a quocunque data, sive *extra* sive *in periculo mortis*, sive *mala* sive *bona fide* impertita."

Nevertheless, the same writer in the recent edition of his most valuable treatise, *De Matrimonio*, appears to modify this judgment to some slight extent "*In periculo mortis*, item invalida dicenda est, attento praesertim Decreto S. Officii 13 Jan., 1932, nisi forte verificentur peculiaria adiuncta de quibus supra. . . ." The reference is to the following exception "Si pars catholica sit bene disposita et serio spondeat se conditiones servaturam, licet pars acatholica illarum adimplementum promittere renuat, putamus posse dispensari in casu urgentissimae necessitatis, ex. gr. in periculo mortis, si aliter quam per matrimonii celebrationem, conscientiae aut forte etiam prolis legitimationi consuli nequeat, dummodo, quod absolute requiritur, remotum factum fuerit perversionis periculum."<sup>3</sup>

There appears to be a contradiction between these two judgments, and they can be harmonized only by bearing in mind the distinction between the "*conditions*" (jure divino) and the *guarantees* (jure ecclesiastico). Provided the priest assisting at a death bed marriage is satisfied that the danger of perversion is removed, he may grant a dispensation even though the non-Catholic party refuses to give the guarantees required by ecclesiastical law. The use of the word "*cautiones*" in the

<sup>2</sup> Cappello, in *Periodica*, 1932, p. 102.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. 1933, n. 312 and 310, 6.



decree of the Holy Office is a serious objection to this solution of Fr. Cappello, and other commentators upon the document do not make any exception or reservation. "Imo decreti vis ad id pariter protenditur quod scilicet, etiam in periculo mortis, dispensatio ipsa sit prorsus nulla et invalida si quando vel cautiones non praestantur (secus ac quidam mitius opinati erant) vel speciales illi modi seu formae negligantur sine quibus fidelem cautionum executionem a liquidis valeat praepedire. Namque verba decreti efferentia nullitatem earum dispensationum, plane generalia ideoque tangunt omnes et singulos, ad quos fertur decretum ipsum."<sup>4</sup>

In our opinion, it is open to any priest to adopt the solution given by Fr. Cappello who is one of the most thorough and authoritative writers on the subject. It is true that the document speaks of "cautiones." But, as Ter Haar notes, the distinction between "condition" and "guarantee" is often not observed, even in Papal documents: "The 'condition' is the removal of the danger of perversion from the Catholic party, and also from the offspring by a Catholic baptism and education. The 'guarantee' is the formal and public promise made to the Church before the Marriage, that the condition will be fulfilled. . . . The Church can never dispense from the conditions, which must be fulfilled because they are imposed by the divine law.<sup>5</sup> It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that the Church does not demand more for a dispensation *in periculo mortis* than is demanded on the grant of a *sanatio*. The faculty accorded to Ordinaries, conceding the power of *sanatio* is meant precisely to meet such a situation "Sanandi in radice matrimonia attentata . . . cum impedimento mixtae religionis aut disparitatis cultus, dummodo consensus in utroque conjuge perseveret, isque legitime renovari non possit . . . sive quia pars acatholica ad renovandum coram Ecclesia matrimonialem consensum, aut ad cautiones praestandas, ad praescriptum Cod. I.C. can 1061, §2, ullo modo induci nequeat; exceptis casibus: 1. in quo pars acatholica adversatur baptismi vel catholicae educationi utriusque sexus natae vel nasciturae."<sup>6</sup> The matter is not, indeed, beyond dispute, and we are not supposing that a priest assisting at marriage *in periculo mortis* enjoys, in addition to his wide powers, the faculty to grant a *sanatio*. But it does appear that a too rigid insistence on the letter of the ecclesiastical law requiring the "guarantees" even *in periculo mortis*, before a dispensation may be validly granted, would nullify the benevolent legislation of the Church, which is accustomed, at such a time, to be as liberal as the law of God allows.

E. J. M.

<sup>4</sup> Maroto in *Apollinaris*, 1932, p. 11.

<sup>5</sup> *Mixed Marriages*, p. 78.

<sup>6</sup> Formula A, *Facultates Additionales*, S.Cong.S.Off. n. 3.

## MEDIUM VIRTUTIS.

We read in Moral Theology that all the moral virtues have a "medium ex parte objecti," that justice has a "medium rei" and all the other moral virtues a "medium rationis." How does chastity, as it should be practised by the unmarried and total abstinence have this "medium" of which the theologians speak? (J. C.)

## REPLY.

The golden mean of virtue has an illusory exactness unless it is interpreted in a technical sense, for "the mean" is not shared by all the virtues in the same fashion. Nevertheless, it is always present in the technical sense, and the theologians have given a doctrinal sanction to the very popular notion which is expressed in the famous verse :

Est modus in rebus, sunt certi denique fines  
Quos ultra citraque nequit consistere rectum.

"Medium" or "mean" must be accepted in relation to some rule or measure. This rule is right reason. "Virtus de sui ratione ordinat hominem ad bonum: moralis autem virtus proprie est perfectiva appetitivae partis animae circa aliquam determinatam materiam; mensura autem et regula appetitivi motus circa appetibilia est ipsa ratio. Bonum autem cuiuslibet mensurati, et regulati consistit in hoc, quod conformetur suae regulae . . . et ideo patet quod bonum virtutis moralis consistit in adaequatione ad mensuram rationis: manifestum est autem, quod inter excessum et defectum medium est aequalitas, sive conformitas; unde manifeste apparet, quod virtus moralis in medio consistit."<sup>1</sup> The virtue of justice is concerned with external actions and things and the mean is determined absolutely and objectively, without considering the condition and circumstances of the person, but the other virtues are concerned with internal movements which must be measured not mechanically and objectively, but according to the condition and circumstances of the subject.<sup>2</sup> What is temperance in food for one person would be excess for another. The objection with regard to virginity is answered by St. Thomas, in ad 3 of the article cited, and the solution applies to total abstinence "abstinet enim virginitas ab omnibus venereis, et paupertas ab omnibus divitiis propter quod oportet, et secundum quod oportet, idest secundum mandatum Dei, et propter vitam aeternam: si autem hoc fiat secundum quod non oportet, idest secundum aliquam superstitionem illicitam, vel etiam propter inanem gloriam, erit superfluum: si autem non fiat, quando oportet, vel secundum quod oportet, est vitium per defectum. . . ."

E. J. M.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa Theol.*, I-II, q. 64, art. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Billuart, *De Virt.*, art. iv. § 1.

## WAR AND PATRIOTISM.

I have heard it maintained by a conscientious objector to war, under all circumstances, that the Holy Father has made a recent pronouncement upholding the obligation of citizens to fight in a just war. What is the substance of his words? (X.)

## REPLY.

The Holy Father could hardly say anything else without departing from the constant teaching and tradition of Catholic theologians. On the occasion of an audience given to mutilated ex-soldiers from the north of Italy, Pius XI gave a discourse on the subject of duty and patriotism. It was published in the *Osservatore Romano*, April 23rd, 1934, and has been translated into French in *Documentation Catholique*, June 23rd, 1934, col. 1571, from which the following English version of the essential portion has been made: After referring with deep sympathy to their sufferings and their mutilations, witnesses of a calamity which he hoped would never again visit the world, the Holy Father said that they had suffered in this way through fulfilling their duty, the supreme right of every man and of every self-respecting conscience: "There are many duties which are not onerous at all, but rather pleasant and light—duties such as those which devolve upon the fathers and mothers of families, or the duties of Christian charity, which it is a joy to fulfil. But the duties of men in the time of war are of a different character. For the time has come when duty is difficult to perform, when it demands great sacrifice, the sacrifice of one's blood and bodily members. This is what the men who have suffered in the war call to mind. They did their duty, and the recollection of that fact, in spite of the pain and suffering they endured, cannot fail to give them a high, a noble and a legitimate satisfaction, the satisfaction of a task accomplished at the price of so great a sacrifice. The Holy Father is glad, not because of the sacrifices endured by his dear sons, but because they did their duty in spite of the price it cost them."

E. J. M.

## VERNACULAR SCRIPTURES.

Is it lawful to read to the people during Mass the Epistle and Gospel in English from any authorized Catholic version? (X.)

## REPLY.

A decision of the Biblical Commission, April 30th, 1934, published in the *Osservatore Romano*, and translated in *Documentation Catholique*, May 12th, 1934, col. 1221, directs that it is unlawful to read liturgical extracts of the Epistles and Gospels, in the Churches, from translations made from the Greek or Hebrew text: the version must be from the text approved by the Church for use in the Sacred Liturgy.

E. J. M.

F

## CHILDREN OF A MIXED MARRIAGE.

In securing the guarantees for a Mixed Marriage is the phrase "all the children" (de universa prole Canon 1061) to be understood as including those already born to the parties?

## REPLY.

The words of the Canon do not explicitly settle the point, but the authors who advert to it give an affirmative answer to this query: "Et quidem cautiones extenduntur ad universam prolem tam *natam* (ex illicito inter partes commercio ante matrimonium) quam *nascituram*; et hoc licet non dicatur expresse in rel. Canon 1061, §2, tamen subintelligendum est. Quod si proles nata iam usum rationis sit praetergressa, tunc conjuges nec tenentur nec possunt eam nolentem baptizare et catholice educare, sed debent modis omnibus eius conversionem ad catholicam religionem prudenter curare."<sup>1</sup> Apart from any other consideration, there could hardly be the moral certitude regarding the faith of future children which the law requires, if the parent is unwilling to agree to the catholic education of those already born.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, the point is explicitly mentioned in the additional faculties granted now to Ordinaries empowering them to grant a *sanatio* except in the case "in quo pars acatholica adversatur baptismo vel catholicae educationi prolis utriusque sexus natae vel nasciturae."<sup>3</sup>

The case of a widow or widower, the children of whose first marriage have been baptized and educated heretics, is in a different category. Whatever the obligations of such a person towards these children, whether they have attained the age of reason or not, the permission to contract a fresh marriage obviously cannot be contingent on their willingness to secure their conversion. Indirectly the point may bear on the moral certitude required.

E. J. M.

<sup>1</sup> Gasparri, *De Matrimonio*, I, n. 451.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. De Becker, *De Matrim.*, p. 94.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Ter Haar, *Mixed Marriages*, n. 185.

## ROMAN DOCUMENTS

BY THE REV. A. BENTLEY, Ph.D., M.A.

### TRANSFORMATION OF THE VULGATE COMMISSION.

An official account of the transformation of the Vulgate Commission is now available. According to an Apostolic Constitution dated June 15th, 1933, and published in a recent number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, the "Pontifical Commission for the Revision of the Vulgate" has been merged in an entirely new foundation.

It will be remembered that the task of revising the Vulgate was originally projected as part of the work of the Biblical Commission. A separate commission was set up in the year 1907, and the various Benedictine Congregations were invited to collaborate under a Benedictine President nominated by the Pope. It was the late Cardinal Gasquet's distinction to have been the Commission's first and only President, from the year 1907 until his death in 1929.

For one reason or another, since the Cardinal's death, the idea of an international Commission seems to have been abandoned. Death has removed not only the Cardinal, but his Vice-President, Abbot Amelli, and former consultors such as Abbot Chapman. The preliminary work of elaborate photographic collation is long since, for practical purposes, complete. A routine method has been evolved and tested, and all the technical apparatus secured. The urgency of an international appeal is no longer felt.

Henceforward, in virtue of the new Constitution, the continuance of the work is entrusted to the French Benedictines, or, more precisely, to an Abbey erected in Rome under the patronage of St. Jerome, to be continuously staffed from the Abbey of SS. Maurice et Maur at Clervaux, belonging to the Solesmes Congregation of St. Pierre. Dom Henri Quentin, editor of the first two volumes which the Vulgate Commission has so far issued, is made the first Abbot.

The Constitution "*Inter praecipuas*," erecting the new Abbey, declares it immediately subject to the Holy See, with authority to replace the Vulgate Commission in its task of restoring the text of the Vulgate, as well as to undertake other duties prescribed from time to time by the Holy See. The closest relations are to be maintained with the parent abbey, whose abbot is required to make an annual visitation of St. Jerome's along with a representative of the Holy See.

A *motu proprio* dated January 24th, 1934, makes it clear that the new Abbey is included in the Benedictine Confederation set

up in 1893; and declares that the Abbey of St. Jerome enjoys the privileges hitherto granted to "almost all Benedictine Abbeys," viz.: the Cassinese privileges and those which the Solesmes congregation has been allowed to inherit from Cluny, St. Vannes and St. Maur (A.A.S., XXVI, pp. 85 and 290).

#### NEW INDULGENCES.

##### (i.) *Prayers after Mass.*

After the settlement of the Roman Question it was widely inferred that the prayers ordered by Pope Leo XIII after low Mass had lost their *raison d'être* and should therefore cease. The Pope, however, commanded that they should be retained but with a new motive, as an intercession for Russia. A more recent decree calls attention to them once more, and adds an indulgence of ten years, in addition to the seven years' indulgence already attached to the triple invocation "Most Sacred Heart of Jesus, have mercy on us" (A.A.S., XXVI, p. 312).

##### (ii.) *Blessed Sacrament Indulgences.*

Three forms of prayer in honour of the Blessed Sacrament have been indulgenced by a common decree, dated June 4th, 1934. To each is added a partial indulgence on condition that the prayer is recited piously and with a contrite heart. A plenary indulgence may be gained once a month on the usual conditions, if the prayer is recited daily for a whole month.

The antiphon *O sacrum convivium*, followed by the versicle and response *Panem de caelo* and the prayer *Deus qui nobis* with a short conclusion, is enriched by a partial indulgence of seven years and a plenary indulgence once a month.

To the hymn *O salutaris Hostia* with its closing stanza *Unitrinoque Domino . . . Amen* is attached a partial indulgence of five years, plenary once a month.

The ejaculation "I adore Thee every moment, O living Bread of Heaven, great Sacrament" (*Vi adoro ogni momento, O vivo Pan del ciel, gran Sacramento*), which forms part also of a longer prayer already indulgenced, now receives a separate indulgence of three hundred days, with a plenary indulgence once a month (A.A.S., XXVI, p. 313).

#### JUBILEE BEATIFICATIONS AND CANONIZATIONS.

In the March number of this REVIEW (Vol. VII, p. 256) a brief paragraph noted the unprecedented number of Causes of Beatification and Canonization which are now being handled by the S.C. of Rites. The activities of the S.C. are still chronicled right on into July; but the approach of the summer recess suggests an additional note now by way of retrospect.

The Jubilee list of completed Causes overflowed beyond the limits foreseen in February. To the series of canonizations we



must add the names of St. Joseph Benedict Cottolengo and St. Teresa Margaret Redi (both canonized on March 19th), and that of St. Conrad of Parzham (May 20th). The Beatifications also include those of Bl. Anthony Mary Claret (February 25th), Bl. Peter René Rogues (May 10th), and Bl. Elizabeth Bichier des Ages (May 13th). For the first time in recorded history, the Pope selected two of the Sundays in Lent, instead of more festive days, for two of the canonizations.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Our Blessed Lady.* The Cambridge Summer School Lectures for 1933. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 6s.)

The title of these collected papers is significant. It might have been *The Virgin Mary* or *The Mother of Christ* or one of half a dozen other titles that come to the mind. But no, *Our Blessed Lady*, a familiar and beautiful expression that at once sounds the note that is to dominate the voices of every one of the twelve lecturers, and is to ring its echo in the minds of every Catholic hearer. To the disciple whom Jesus loved, and who indeed represented (but in no modernistic sense) every faithful disciple who is loved by and who loves Jesus, it was said: *Son, behold thy Mother*; and from that hour the disciple took her as his own. How the Church has taken her and made her its beloved possession is shown on every page of these published lectures. Well up to the standard of the Summer School this volume should prove a favourite, especially among the laity. The only fault we can find is in the bibliography, which might have been considerably enriched; some works (for example, Campana *Maria nel Dogma Cattolico*) are surprisingly omitted.

Dr. Arendzen begins with the Mother of the Seed (Gen. iii.) and passes on to the Virgin who conceived God-with-us (Is. vii.). He could not have chosen two better passages to bear out the teaching of the Old Testament; and within the space at his disposal his exposition of the texts is surpassingly brilliant. Some readers will consider his paper the most scholarly in the book. Fr. Lattey, S.J., takes the teaching of Our Lady's Gospel (Luke i.-ii.) and leaves no stone unturned that might hide any detail of Our Lady's influence. With eager devotion he goes beyond the limits of his subject to show Mary helping St. Luke with the beginning of *Acts* and watching over the infancy of the Church as she watched over the Infant in the manger. This would seem to leave meagre scope for Fr. Ronald Knox's paper on Our Lady in the New Testament, yet with enthusiastic love he actually complains of the restriction of "so large a subject" within the limits of a single lecture! Perhaps every reader will not follow his suggestion that Mary did not accompany her Son during His ministry: she was at Cana, she was in the crowd (Mark iii. 31), she was at the foot of the Cross; and her absence at other times is based simply *e silentio*. Again,

we are not inclined to agree that she was "greeted with a rebuff" at Cana. On the other hand, Fr. Knox gives us a beautiful suggestion that "Our Lady's influence radiated from the Cenacle, modifying, silently but profoundly, the whole organization of the Christian commonwealth"; and we are pleased to find that "My hour" in John ii. is taken to mean "My Passion." Well does the writer claim that "the second chapter of *St. John* would be quite unintelligible without the nineteenth."

The difficult task of showing (within twenty-five pages) how tradition and the Fathers have regarded Our Lady is successfully accomplished by Dr. Cartmell. Other and perhaps more telling passages will suggest themselves to certain readers, but Dr. Cartmell's choice has been well made.

Dr. Flynn prefaces his paper on the Immaculate Conception with the remark: "I know of no doctrine which is at once so easy to believe and so hard to prove as the Immaculate Conception"; but it would be difficult to find elsewhere an abler exposition of the dogma within the compass of less than thirty pages. Particularly interesting is the English evidence during the progress of the teaching. With regard to St. Thomas there is no mincing the matter: "his very definite language makes it clear that he was opposed to the true doctrine." From Dr. Flynn we pass to Fr. Hugh Pope, O.P., who in a splendid paper marshals the objections of the modernists against the Virgin Birth and the Perpetual Virginity of Our Lady, and disposes of them with a skill that would have evoked applause from St. Jerome.

How "inextricably woven" into the fabric of Catholic dogma is the divine Maternity is shown by Dr. Smith in his paper on *Mary, the Mother of God*. Here the Nestorian heresy and its implications are admirably traced, and the reader becomes more aware of the immediate and necessary connection between the divine Maternity and the Incarnation. Dr. Smith also contributes the paper on the Assumption, arguing from the celebration of the Feast from the sixth century that the Church virtually teaches that the doctrine is true. By no means is it quite easy to account for the silence of the first five centuries, but Dr. Smith gives excellent reasons that go to prove that this silence should never beget hesitancy.

Seminarists of the future may be alarmed when Dr. Rhodes suggests that theological conclusions following from the definition of the Immaculate Conception are as yet in their infancy, and that in few branches of theology is there a wider scope for additional propositions. In his paper on Our Lady's endowments he ably discusses what Fr. Lattey earlier in the book described as "a not very easy or obvious question," namely, the question of Our Lady's knowledge. Perhaps it would have been well had the apparent difficulties in the Gospel narrative to which Fr. Lattey alludes (and others could be added) been solved here for the benefit of the lay reader. Murillo's picture in the Corsini Gallery at Rome might satisfy Dr. Rhodes in his beautiful and

valid contention that in physical appearance the Son must have been exceptionally like the Mother.

No more qualified writer could have been chosen to tell us about Lourdes than Dom Izard, O.S.B. By quotation and fact he vividly illustrates his main thesis that a purpose of Lourdes was to restore the miraculous element in Christianity at a time when contemporary thought was at about its lowest materialistic level.

Recent theology has had much to say about the terms Co-redemptrix and Mediatrix as applied to Our Lady. The subject demands very careful expression, for here it is that certain pious writers have proved themselves bad theologians; and so we congratulate Fr. Bellanti on his cautious handling of this delicate matter. The priest in the pulpit may well know what he means when he speaks of Co-redemptrix, but unless he is a lucid preacher the congregation in the benches may easily absorb ideas that are totally false.

Into his paper on Devotion and Devotions to Our Lady, Dr. Garvin has collected fresh and most interesting matter. We hope that he will follow the editor's suggestion for a fuller treatment of the same theme. Dr. Grimley closes the volume with a survey of the Protestant attitude to Our Lady. Yes, it is a savage attitude towards the Incarnation and the Atonement, and a total misunderstanding or ignorance of the Communion of Saints that has driven Mary out of her Dowry; and did they but know it, her Son, as the Son of God, went out from them with her.

T. E. BIRD.

*Oberammergau.* By Elizabeth H. C. Corathiel. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 3s. 6d.)

*The Sacred Mysteries.* A Pageant-Drama by Rev. Mathias Helfen. (Catholic Dramatic Movement, U.S.A.)

Although the number of guide-books to Oberammergau and its Passion Play is legion, Miss Corathiel has produced one that is different and one that is, therefore, more than welcome. A more knowledgeable guide or more delightful companion could hardly be desired. She knows her Oberammergau through and through and loves both the place and the people. In her book she traces the history of the village from its earliest times; she explains the origin of the Play and recounts its early struggles for existence; she takes you behind the scenes at the Passion Theatre and shows you the modern methods of play production that are employed; she introduces you to some of the leading artists, who are her personal friends, and takes you to see their homes and to meet their families; she concludes with some practical advice as to what to wear, what to avoid, places of interest in the neighbourhood and on the journey home. Altogether it is a very satisfying book and one that can be strongly recommended not only to those who are making their first visit to Oberammergau but also to those who have seen the Play and wish to recall happy memories.

The nineteenth centenary of the Redemption, which the present performances of the Oberammergau Passion Play so suitably commemorate, is the inspiration of Father Helfen's Sacred Drama. He has taken for his theme the Holy Mass, as illustrating the chief benefits of the Redemption—the Blessed Eucharist and the Priesthood—and has produced an excellent play. The theme is well conceived, cleverly worked out, and skilfully presented. Unfortunately, it is impossible to give an adequate idea of his methods. A Pilgrim, in search of true knowledge, meets Truth, who leads him to a Catholic church where Mass is about to be celebrated. As the magnificent pageantry of the Sacred Mysteries is unfolded, Truth explains to the Pilgrim the meaning of each part and links it up with the past. There are scenes of intense dramatic interest, such as the Consecration, when on the first stage Christ and His Apostles celebrate the Last Supper, while on the second stage the priest at the altar says the prayers of the Canon of the Mass.

A very large cast is required; also a choir and orchestra and a well-equipped stage. Very few Catholic societies will have sufficient resources to do the play justice and, in its present form, it would not pass the Lord Chamberlain; for in England it is not lawful to represent Our Lord on a public stage.

One word of criticism. The opening scene, which resolves itself into a dissertation on Truth, is too long and might bore a modern audience.

W. P. S.

*Saga of Saints.* By Sigrid Undset. Translated by E. C. Ramsden. (pp. 321. Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d. net.)

The novels of Sigrid Undset have been far from unsuccessful in England and America, but they have hardly had the full appreciation they deserve, in part perhaps due to a similar cause to that which made a failure of that superb film *Hallelujah*—of which the pious critics complained that it was "not nice" and the irreligious ones complained that it was "religious." Those Catholics who already know Fru Undset will not need to be told to read *Saga of Saints*, and those who do not may be attracted by the subject—the saints of Norway—to make her acquaintance.

After a masterly chapter on the coming of Christianity to Norway, we are given accounts of SS. Sunniva and the Selje-men (tenth century), Olav Haroldsson (d. 1030), Hallvard (d. 1043), Magnus of Orkney (d. 1116), Eystein of Nidaros (d. 1188), and Thorfinn of Hamar (d. 1285). Of these, Sunniva, Olav, and Thorfinn apparently are venerated liturgically by Norwegian Catholics and the feast of Magnus is observed in the diocese of Aberdeen; Olav is, moreover, named in the Roman Martyrology. Hitherto there has been little about any of these saints in English. The original *Butler's Lives* gives brief accounts of Olav and Magnus (and, curiously enough, of King Harold Bluetooth, who was very doubtfully a saint), and Sunniva is added to the revised edition, while Baring-Gould

made good use of the pertinent sagas in his *Lives of the Saints*. The series is rounded off by a chapter on a Norwegian Barnabite, Father Karl Schilling (d. 1907), the cause of whose beatification has been begun. He became a clerk regular soon after his conversion from Lutheranism in 1854, and the story of his long life in France and Italy, always hoping to be sent back to his beloved Norway but gladly submissive to the will of God and of his superiors, is most moving. One cannot help wondering why he was withheld from a mission notably lacking in indigenous priests.

Fru Undset's competence as an historian is confirmed in this book; while she does not disdain legend, she does not allow the reader to suppose it is certain fact, and her realism (by which word I do not mean naturalism) is most refreshing. Nevertheless, *Saga of Saints* is not a technical work of hagiography but emphatically one of general interest.

The translation reads well, and there are reproductions of half a dozen lovely statues and paintings, but the railway-poster wrapper is a pity; and there ought to be an index.

DONALD ATTWATER.

*Two Hundred Evening Sermon Notes.* By the Rev. F. H. Drinkwater. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 5s.)

This a new edition of Fr. Drinkwater's well-known volume at a reduced price. There is a very useful series of sermons on God which may suggest how increasingly important it is for us to remember this supreme theme of our preaching; several series on the words and deeds of Our Lord's life, passion, death and resurrection; series on the Sunday epistles, Our Lady, the Saints, etc. Fr. Drinkwater's method is to give a list of points with brief notes on each, leaving the preacher to fill in the sermon for himself, which is probably the most useful method of all but which does not commend itself to every reader. The book has proved itself in the past and it is a pleasure to recommend this new edition to those who do not yet know it.

T. E. F.

*Religious Certainty.* By Martin J. Scott, S.J., Litt.D. (P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. \$1.50.)

Father Scott, whose popular apologetics are well known throughout the United States, still maintains his powerful presentation of the fundamental facts of religion, in *Religious Certainty*. The work is planned to answer the three basic questions confronting the inquirer into Catholicism: 1, Is Christ God? 2, Did He establish an infallible and perpetual Church? 3, Is the Catholic Church the one thus established? The traditional arguments of Fundamental Theology are clearly and candidly put forth and current objections are speedily spread-eagled en route. It is a book which will command the respect of the non-Catholic and will prove valuable to Catechists of the Catholic Evidence Guild.

J. G.



# THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD

## I. ROME.

BY THE REV. R. L. SMITH, Ph.D., M.A.

For months past—indeed ever since the closing of the Holy Door—Rome has been full of rumours about the Pope's going to Castelgandolfo. At first we heard he was to leave the Vatican immediately; then that May and June would be the months chosen. But the Holy Father has not gone yet. Certainly July and August would seem a better choice from the point of view of heat. August sees the departure of many important people from the Congregations; which reduces the volume of business transacted and makes August the best month for the Pope to be out of Rome.

It is confidently asserted that he has given orders for the restoration of the Appartamento Nobile in the Vatican and that therefore he must be going to his Villa. I do not know whether the first is a fact, and the second is by no means a necessary consequence. The Holy Father, during the slack season, could confine himself to his private apartments on the third floor and yet have room for audiences. But it is significant that his visit to Castelgandolfo on May 20th was mainly concerned not with the farm and the gardens but with the arrangements in the Papal palazzo itself. And the pressure of his family, the doctors and his personal suite is continuous that he should take a rest and a change. It is difficult to picture Pius XI taking a rest. I merely chronicle the content of current rumour.

Difficulties have arisen with Peru, where Archbishop Gaetano Cicognani is Nuncio, over the legalizing of divorce by Congress. There is no concordat between the Republic and the Vatican. Their relations are in one sense unilateral despite complete diplomatic representation between the two Powers. The Constitution of 1860 laid down that Catholicism was the religion of the State and that the practice of no other cult was allowed. The second part of this article was suppressed in 1914 and did not reappear in the Constitution of 1919. But the Republic claimed to be heir to all the privileges of the Spanish Crown, formerly exercised in its territory, and so Article 121 of the Constitution gives the President the right of patronage and presentation.

The *modus vivendi* has been found in the Holy See's approval of the Government's candidate. But this is obviously not an ideal system, and when the Vatican cannot agree, as in the famous case of the nomination by the Argentine Government of Monsignor D'Andrea to the Archbishopric of Buenos Aires, has led to serious difficulties. The Peruvian Constitution allows for



negotiation on such nominations, permitting the President to come to an agreement with the Holy See according to the directions laid down by Congress. But this makes Congress sovereign in the purely religious sphere of the nomination of Bishops, which is impossible theoretically, though the Government make it possible in practice by selecting thoroughly worthy candidates.

It is the unilateral nature of the Peruvian Constitution in religious matters which intensifies the difficulties over this divorce law. The Masons and Protestants, not to mention native anti-clericals, are following the familiar plan of concentrating on the cities. If they should conquer these, they do not doubt their ability to impose their will on the country. Peru is a vast territory, about five times as large as Great Britain, with a population only of some five million inhabitants. This only increases the importance of the cities. The position is therefore very strained and the Archbishop of Lima, Monsignor Peter Fafan, has ordered the closing of all churches for twenty-four hours as a protest against the new law. On the other hand, it would seem that the Government are not enamoured of their latest child. They have bowed to the extremists in the hope that thereby the Catholics will be roused to action. One can only hope that this will be the case. But it shows how far the enemies' plan of concentrating on the cities has already succeeded.

## II. CENTRAL EUROPE.

BY C. F. MELVILLE.

### *Germany and Austria.*

Just as negotiations between the German Bishops and the German Government, for the implementing of the provisions of the Concordat, had arrived at a satisfactory stage, Germany was suddenly convulsed by a political crisis of the first magnitude.

Herr Hitler suppressed with great ferocity a plot against the régime alleged to have been hatched by Storm Troop Leader Roehm and his friends on the Left in connivance with General von Schleicher on the Right. A mysterious, because unnamed, Foreign Power was also supposed to have been involved.

As to whether the "plot" was a genuine one or was merely another "Reichstag Fire," designed to enable Herr Hitler and General Goering to get rid of elements which were potentially embarrassing to the régime, is as yet impossible to say with any certainty. No tears need be shed for the death of notorious degenerates, such as Roehm, Heines and others. The air will be the cleaner for their demise. On the other hand, the badness of these men is not a justification of the ruthless methods employed.

Official explanations that these violent methods were necessary to save the State from this alleged plot of the Right and the Left are hardly convincing, especially as amongst the victims were a number of Catholic Leaders—including Herr Klausener, head of Catholic Action, Herr Gerlich, formerly editor of the Catholic paper *Der Gerade Weg*, and Herr Probst, leader of the Catholic *Deutsche Jugendkraft*—who quite obviously were aligned neither with Roehm and his circle nor with General von Schleicher. Probably it will be many months before it will be possible to get to the bottom of it all, and thus truth may go begging for a long while yet. But whatever the real explanation of these events may turn out to be, it is obvious that they have profoundly changed the German situation and that things will never be quite the same again.

In the first place, it is clear that National-Socialism as a revolutionary force now no longer exists. Herr Hitler has rid himself of the Radical elements which raised him to power. No longer relying on the Brown Shirts in the streets, the Führer now depends upon the "S.S." and the secret police. Thus, although his régime may have emerged from the blood bath with a great show of strength, its original glamour has disappeared, probably for good. It is likewise clear that the Reichswehr, and the Right, in giving their continued support to Herr Hitler, are doing so on certain very definite conditions. His Government is therefore now further to the Right than before. This being the case the struggle of forces has undoubtedly been removed from the religious to the sociological plane. Therefore, both anti-Christianism and anti-Semitism will, probably, be less violent than heretofore. The problems now facing the Third Reich are of a concrete nature, and anti-religious diversions will now hardly avail as a substitute for grappling with urgent political and economic questions. It may, perhaps, turn out to be the case that henceforth the Church will be less violently assailed by the pagan elements in Nazism.

This is not to say that there will not be further troubles ahead. Germany is probably only at the beginning of a period of intense unrest. Anything may happen. But the immediate outlook for the Church would seem to be improved, if only for the fact that the radically anti-Christian elements in the régime have been either killed or have become of less account.

The events in Germany have naturally had their effect upon opinion in Austria, where, it seems, a number of local Nazis have been disillusioned as a result of Herr Hitler's ruthless treatment of his erstwhile lieutenants. It would, however, probably be easy to over-estimate the extent to which this disillusionment has gone.

Dr. Dollfuss is nevertheless determined to seize this opportunity for the taking of strong measures against the Nazi terrorists in Austria, and those found in possession of explosives will henceforth be summarily executed.

The mission of Austria as a refuge of the true German Christian culture was emphasized in speeches made on the occasion of the recent pilgrimage to Mariazell.

Cardinal Innitzer paid a glowing tribute to Chancellor Dollfuss whom he alluded to as the successor of Mgr. Seipel in the carrying out of the great work of re-Christianizing Austria. He prayed that God would give strength to the Chancellor to continue this work. The Bishops, he said, stood firmly behind Dr. Dollfuss.

Dr. Dollfuss thanked the Priesthood for their understanding of his task of the rebuilding of Austria. It was not enough, he added, to have a Catholic Constitution and a Concordat, but everyone must contribute to this work in his own sphere of life, especially in the home. Propaganda must be made for the Christian idea.

The Summer School, organized by the Catholic Faculty of Salzburg, will take place this year from the 7th to the 26th of August. Its aim will be the teaching of science from the Catholic standpoint.

When the Summer School was organized last year, many wondered if it could succeed in face of the ban placed by the German Government on Germans going to Austria. Nevertheless, some 600 Austrian and other Germans living outside the Reich attended. An even bigger success is anticipated this year.

#### *A Yugoslav Congress of Catholic Catechists.*

The Congress of Yugoslav Catholic Catechists was held at Maribor under the presidency of the Bishop, Mgr. Tomasic, assisted by Mgr. Gnidovec, Bishop of Skopje and Prizren. Telegrams were sent to the Pope and King Alexander transmitting the homage of the members.

It is well known, of course, that, with some exceptions, the State in Yugoslavia takes charge of primary, secondary and higher instruction, and that the catechists are in reality the teachers of religious knowledge, belonging to the different "cults" recognized by the State.

The Congress of Maribor has for a long time discussed all the questions relative to the teaching of religion in the secondary establishment, and has voted a resolution which constitutes, so to speak, an answer to certain professors who favour integral or partial secularization.

The congressists in particular have risen up against the insinuation that the Catholic Church prevented the education of youth in a spirit of national unity. They have also protested against the attempts of those who want to decrease the influence of the Church over scholastic Youth by demanding the suppression of religious instruction in the higher classes of the colleges.

## REVIEW OF REVIEWS

In the July MONTH, Fr. C. A. Newdigate, S.J., the Vice-Postulator of the English Martyrs' Cause, gives some authentic information about the prophecy popularly attributed to Gregory Gunnes, an old priest, that Tyburn, the place of Blessed Edmund Campion's martyrdom, would eventually be the site of a religious house. In the course of an account contained in three documents in the Record Office, now published apparently for the first time, some details concerning the apprehension of Gregory Gunne are given, including the "information" of one Richard Davison "... Then said Arden, Howe canne you prayse Campion, being so arrant a traitor as he was? Then answered Gunne, Saye not so, for the day will come, and I hope to see yt, and so may you too, that there shall be an offeringe where Campion did suffer. Then said Arden: What, shall we offer unto the Gallows? Noe, not so, said Gunne, but you shall see a religious howse buylte there for an offeringe. . . ." Fr. Newdigate adds two other similar extracts which show the faith and hopefulness of Catholics, even during the persecution, in the ultimate recognition of the justice of their cause, and he expresses the hope that the little convent at Tyburn may one day be replaced by a worthy national monument to the memory of our martyrs.

"Father Jerome" receives a considerable amount of attention in the June BLACKFRIARS. In an article which is largely inspired by Dr. Messenger's *Rome and Reunion*, a collection of Papal pronouncements on the subject, Fr. Victor White, O.P., records that what is, we think, the opinion of most careful observers, that corporate reunion is far beyond the horizon of practical politics, that it holds out a vain expectation, as Leo XIII said, and leads the minds of non-Catholics away from the faith. The writer concludes with a plea for the liturgical movement, the central force of which should be among the people in the nave of the church. By developing more fully the potentialities of our own Catholic life and faith, there will be found a surer way to understanding, and so to unity, with our non-Catholic fellow countrymen. A second contribution from Fr. St. John, O.P., attempts to restate "Father Jerome's" contention in a modified form and without his misapprehensions of the situation.

In the HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW for July, Mgr. H. T. Henry gives a very useful and carefully indexed summary of matter suited to sermons on Saints' lives in modern hagiography. References are given to easily obtainable books dealing with the lives and characteristics of over 100 Saints. Dr. MacEachen discusses the moral problem of *Ectopic Gestation*, in which the Papal decisions are explained in the light of ascertained surgical testimony.

In RECHERCHES DE SCIENCE RELIGIEUSE, 1934, n.3, M. Guy de Broglie contributes the first instalment of an ethical study on the intrinsic malice of sin. Unlike the sin of the angels, who chose simply that which their will purposed to obtain, human

sin has a moral malice from its particular object which may be multiplex and quite distinct from the ultimate purpose of the agent. In the same number, M. Charles de Moré-Pontgibaud outlines the developments in the thought of M. Ed. Le Roy, who, after a long period of silence, has shown fresh literary activity. The work of M. Le Roy also enters largely into REVUE THOMISTE for June in the article by M. Baillot on Emile Boutroux. Fr. Humbert Bouessé, O.P., defends in the same issue, with copious quotations from St. Thomas, the efficient instrumental causality of the Humanity of Christ and of the Sacraments. ANGELICUM for July contains a welcome piece of historical research on St. Dominic and the Universities. In REVUE NEOSCOLASTIQUE DE PHILOSOPHIE Mr. D. E. Sharp continues his account of the teaching of the English Dominican, Thomas of Sutton, explaining in this number the Metaphysics as contained in the Merton College manuscript.

THOUGHT for June contains a study of the *Petty Jury* by Mr. Fullhardt, in which it is shown that the process of its evolution was based on expediency rather than dictated by reason. He suggests many constitutional alterations, to remove some of the bulk of judicial inertia which encumbers the system. For example, why has the number twelve such a great hold on the popular mind? Why not have, say, fifteen, and permit a majority of twelve to record a verdict? The recognized right of the judge to set aside a verdict as being against the weight of evidence, a recognition that a judge is better able to evaluate evidence than a body of twelve laymen, would seem to require that the jury should have the benefit of his superior judgment before leaving the jury box.

Fr. J. Toohey, S.J., makes a friendly protest against the "language" which is the evil genius of every philosopher. There is a lot to be said for his view that the philosopher often persuades himself that he is immersed in some subtle question of metaphysics, when he is simply, as a matter of fact, bemused with words. He advocates that the first step in any philosophical enquiry should be to set out the subject to be investigated fully, exactly and literally. Fr. McGarry, S.J., comments on the new Westminster Version of the *Acts of the Apostles*, pointing out the chief headings of variation from the Douay. In some few cases he prefers the Douay version as, for example, "Hell" for "the grave" in texts such as "thou wilt not leave my soul in Hell"; and "Son" for "Servant." This latter choice of word is one of the chief points of the criticism offered, and Fr. McGarry regrets that, owing to the artificial character of the word, we cannot be as bold as the early Christians and use neither "Son" nor "servant" but call Jesus the "Boy of God."

In the DUBLIN REVIEW for July two articles are devoted to Pascal. Mr. N. Abercrombie examines his adhesion to Jansenism, showing that his heresy, if that is not too strong a word to use, was due to an accident of his life and environment. Nevertheless, certain errors of Baius and an erroneous view concerning

the function of Revelation enter very fundamentally into his religious thought. Mr. H. F. Stewart, in an article entitled *Pascal: The Last Stage in the Light of Recent Research*, deals with some documents brought to light by M. Jovy which give a picture of Pascal in the last few months of his life. In the same number, Mr. L. J. Stanley continues his study of the *Catholic Church in Nazi Germany*. There are also two Memoirs, one of *Henri Bremond*, by Charles du Bos, and the other of *Fr. Bede Jarrett, O.P.*, by Fr. B. Delaney, O.P.

The pride of place in periodical biography must go to the *Downside Review*, the July number of which is entirely devoted to the late *Abbot Butler*. Dom David Knowles, in the course of nearly a hundred pages, gives us a very substantial life of the Abbot, though it is modestly called a memoir. This is followed by a study of his work and thought, and a bibliography of everything written by him between the years 1883-1934.

*ESTUDIAS FRANCISCANS*, 1934, fasc. 1 and 2, contains a contribution in Latin by Fr. M. Bauerle on the views which have been sustained, by some theologians, on the difficult problem of Baptism *in voto*, as applied to the children of pious Catholic parents who die without baptism. The remaining articles are of purely Franciscan interest. Many of our readers might like to have their attention called to an article on Fr. Louis of Lavagna, founder of the English Capuchin Province, in the January issue of *COLLECTANEA FRANCISCANA*.

Fr. B. Mariani, O.F.M., writes in *ANTONIANUM* for July on the fulfilment of the prophecy of Malachias i. 11, part of a series of studies on the subject which are not yet completed. It is fitting to mention, in this connection, though it is not a periodical publication, except in a loose sense, the admirable edition of this prophecy by Fr. Lattey, S. J., which has recently appeared in the Westminster Version. E. J. M.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### MASS IN DOMINICAN CONVENT CHAPELS.

Fr. C. Lattey, S.J., writes from Heythrop College:

May I be allowed to suggest, as the fruit of some experience, that a practical solution of the difficulty (or a large part of it) is to print (or bind in) the Roman Ordinary of the Mass (*Ordo Missae*) at the end of Dominican missals intended for non-Dominican priests? This is cheaper and more effective than to provide a Roman missal. Holy Week presents a problem that perhaps can only be solved by the publication of an approved book.

---

*Permissu Superiorum.*

---



his  
titled  
leals  
ve a  
the  
the  
oirs,  
r of

the  
oted  
se of  
the  
owed  
very-

con-  
have  
n of  
nolic  
are  
like  
s of  
the

y on  
eries  
it is  
tical  
this  
d in  
M.

nce,  
f it)  
*Ordo*  
non-  
than  
blem  
an

---

---